

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

APRIL, 1863.

ART. I.—*The Journal of Agriculture.* No. LXXVIII. Oct.
Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London.

AGRICULTURE is fast rising to the rank of a science. It will never, perhaps, gain a separate niche among recognised sciences, but it is every day becoming more scientific. Individual experience and local tradition and general custom used alone to guide the work of the farmer. Each man followed the routine which his fathers had followed before him; or, at the most, borrowed a hint from some more enterprising neighbour; or in the most enlightened districts struck out cautiously and diffidently, some improvement from his own brain. But innovations were rare, and were viewed with little favour by the class most interested in them, and were not often so obviously desirable as to command success. Now, however, among advanced Agriculturists, every detail is sought to be carried out after fixed principles—and abstract sciences, such as chemistry and mechanics, and physiology, are called in to develop and to perfect the operations of Nature—and desultory individual projects are swallowed up and systematized by Agricultural Associations—with Central and County and district societies, with Chairmen and Secretaries and annual meetings, and prizes, and dinners with their subsequent speeches, and all the apparatus of a flourishing and popular Institution. Though there is much in the movement to which exception may be taken—it is an important, and an increasing, and apparently an enduring one. And while it partakes in the general interest which the Church must feel in the material and social and intellectual well-being of any large class in her communion—it particularly demands the consideration of all whose lot has thrown them, whether as clergy or proprietors, among a rural population. An increase of intelligence and education is, if judiciously directed, an increase of strength to her. When a knowledge of farming was

gained by experience alone, a country Incumbent had necessarily little in common, apart from his official and spiritual relation, with the every-day life of the farmers of his parish. But now that men of intellect and enterprise are stirring in the pursuit, and that Agriculture has established a literature, and challenges the name and attributes of a science, a clergyman can take a reasonable interest in the occupations of his parishioners, and exert that influence which familiarity with his subject puts in the power of every educated man, when the minds and habits of those below him are passing through a period of transition.

Such a period is now disturbing Agricultural life. Like the opinion which used to be heard with respect to the fitness of a younger son for the Church, it was thought, thirty years ago, that if a man was good for nothing else, he was good enough for a farmer. Good physical power, more or less of industry, and, if some steadiness, so much the better—and these were about all the qualities required. As for activity, education, habits of business, or a love for improvement, or an ambition to keep pace with the progress of the age, or a power of taking advantage of, and adapting to his own purposes, modern discoveries—they would have been as much out of place in a model farmer of a generation or two back, as in one of his own sleepy cart horses. If every year his land bore scantier crops, or, at any rate, did not produce above a scanty average, he supposed it was going against nature to expect it otherwise, and submitted. If his stock were few in number, and unprofitable and of a bad breed, and deteriorating in every generation, he thought he had about as many and about as good a lot as his neighbour, so he thrust his hands into some profounder depths of his pockets, and acquiesced. He paid his labourer low wages, but he took him for better or worse, kept him as long as any work could be got out of him, and then sent him on the parish.

It will be a long time before the change which, within the last few years, has come over what are called the crack Agricultural counties, will make itself felt in every corner of its present area, or will take possession of the whole kingdom. The old system is too deeply rooted, and has too many vested interests, to be eradicated in one generation. There is not a greater difference between the art of cotton-spinning before the time of Arkwright and Strutt, and the perfection to which a Manchester millowner can now carry it, than between farming as it was last century, and as it is now in Essex or Bedfordshire. But, while by the laws of trade, the cheaper and more finished process of manufacture will alone meet the demands of the market, and the inferior must inevitably improve or withdraw; the conditions of Agricultural success are less stringent. The old-fashioned

system will cling to the soil for many a long day, and in many an odd nook and corner, just as the roots of a tree will throw up shoots long after the main trunk is to all appearance dead. It is not to be expected that the art of husbandry will advance with such strides as manufacture has done and is still doing. There are not the same means at command, nor is there the same competition, nor the same field and opportunity, nor the same prize for success. In the manufactures, the capitalist and the man of business are one and the same person; so every suggested or attempted improvement appeals to him who has the means, and whose immediate interest it is, to turn it to account. And again, the gains of a successful hit or a lucky invention by a manufacturer, must always enormously surpass the returns of capital invested ever so remuneratively upon land. And where the profits are higher, the competition will be keener, and trade more adventurous and speculative; and the constant and pressing call for improvement in machinery and fabric will of itself tend to satisfy the want which it creates. But Agriculture has these aids and incitements to restless advance in a less degree. It does not admit of extensive speculation. Its profits are moderate and steady, and incapable of exceeding a certain and easily-reached limit; and, what is its greatest impediment, it has to depend upon two distinct classes, one of whom holds the purse and the other does the work. And although the true interests of landlord and tenant run together, it is not always recognised to be so by both, nor, after all, is the effect the same as though the two were absolutely identical. However, let its inherent drawbacks be what they may, Agriculture is surely and firmly advancing.

The farmer is looking up in the world, or, to put it more truthfully, he is being looked up. His age has taken him under its guidance, and will not let him creep along his old beaten track. So he must be patronized and petted, and become a fashion, and listen to speeches and compete for prizes. He must be told that he is always lagging a generation or two behind—that he knows next to nothing of his own business, and that the sooner he confesses his ignorance and opens his ears to his instructors, the better for him—that if he would only acknowledge his good fortune, his calling is the most happy, and the most enviable, and the most beneficial to his country. It is wonderful how soon men learn to believe all that is told them about themselves. Independent as he may look, the typical farmer is at bottom a very shy sort of man; he likes to keep pretty much to himself and to his kind. Yet, under the titillating influence of the caressing which has been heaped upon him these few years, he has become gregarious, and has waxed

eloquent on platforms, and is met with at shows, entering his name for prizes with all the ardour of a neophyte in the pursuit.

That there is much that is admirable and highly useful in these various Agricultural Societies which are cropping up all over the country, we fully believe. They give a fillip and an impetus to husbandry generally. They bring into friendly intercourse and competition, labourer, and tenant, and landlord. They form an evidence and a memorial of the progress which has been made. They give an opportunity for suggesting and sifting and testing improvements. They detect and expose abuses. If a man of position has anything to say upon the subject, they bring together a sympathizing and, at the same time, critical and practical audience, before whom to deliver himself. And they manifestly forward their primary object of raising to a higher standard the cultivation of the ground, and the growth of corn, and the breed of cattle. This is their brighter aspect. On the other side, a certain amount of bustle and parade seem inevitable when different classes of men meet together under such circumstances. Speeches fall into a tone of patronage and intrusive advice. The benefits which the farmer and the labourer are receiving are insisted upon too frequently, and dilated upon too unreservedly. Their pursuits are described in terms too ardent and imaginative, too much as the speaker thinks that they ought to be, or has read that they are. It may be well that men should be lifted above the earth now and then for one glowing hour; but when they are let down again into the dull and material, and may be, gross and sordid reality of the morrow, the effect cannot be inspiring. Yet, deducting for a certain amount of exaggerated sentiment, and condescension and superfluous speech-making, there is a business-like air about these Agricultural Associations, which is an omen of good. Farmers meet together for other purposes than to be praised and patronized. The talk is after all but a secondary part of the proceedings. It serves the purpose of amusement and relaxation after the day's work is over. It must be endured as a logical and inevitable sequence of the dinner. It raises, no doubt, the tone of the whole meeting, investing it with a light, intellectual atmosphere, which, upon those whose treats in that way are rare, may have an elevating effect.

There was little to call for notice in the speeches which were delivered upon the subject, throughout the country, in the early part of the autumn. After the controversy upon the morality or the good feeling of bestowing a prize upon labourers for long periods of service had subsided, and which, while it lasted, was brisk enough, and which we will return to presently, few of

the addresses rose above a level of rhetorical common-place. And, indeed, when one or two leading truths and obvious principles have been recognised and duly enforced, there is very little to say. It is not to be expected that every man whose position puts him forward to address his tenants or constituents upon a topic so general and so ancient as Agriculture, should be able to tell them anything new, or to cast the well-worn sentiments which he has to utter, into a novel and striking form. When a landlord, who is a practical farmer, tells his neighbours and his tenantry the results of his experience and his hopes from his experiments, his observations are entitled to the respect accorded to every intelligent man who employs eminent opportunities of applying his thought to a pursuit which interests him. Or when a great party leader relieves the strange silence of the recess, by making an oration before an Agricultural meeting, the subject receives at his hands that freshness and vigour of treatment, which an unwonted theme, and a habit of seizing upon the prominent points of any topic occupying the mind, almost invariably insure. But with those whose pursuits have not led them to some practical knowledge of the technicalities and the working of farming life, talking to farmers upon their own business, is a very delicate subject, even to the tact of a practical speaker,—a truth which any one may experience for himself who will leave the subject of pews and poor-rates, and such official matters, and launch into breeding or cross-cropping with the churchwarden of his parish. He will find an opinion upon the weather, which is generally regarded a safe and open question, is received with jealousy and distrust. If he has spent some years in the country, and is tolerably observant, and not too particular and pointed in his remarks, he may diffidently venture to say a few words upon crops generally. But let him dare to utter a sentence about the cultivation of this or that field, or commit himself to a notion upon the merits of this or that seed or stock—and if he has not already intuitively discovered it, he will quickly be enlightened with little superfluous gentleness or circumlocution, as to his profound and abandoned ignorance. A man may be a very good practical farmer, and yet a most feeble speaker; or, on the other hand, a man may be a fine orator, and yet have very misty ideas on the object of a steam-plough, or the intricacies of the four-course system. The days, indeed, have gone by when it would be possible for an educated man to profess to be unacquainted with the common terms of husbandry. The affectation of ignorance has veered round to an affectation of knowledge. Dandies in the days of our grandfathers assumed a studied contempt for country life. Now every retired grocer flies at once from the town

where his fortune has been made, sets up a farm, puts on a rustic gait with his hob-nailed boots, strives to look profound as he munches grains of barley on a market-day, and devotes the energies which were wont to find a laudable occupation in raisins and bacon, to roots and subsoil-draining, and the cultivation of bacon in its unsmoked and nascent stage. But though every one is expected to have some little knowledge of, and every one pretends to no little experience in, country pursuits;—for a man will not defend his honesty more indignantly than his horsemanship,—it is an expectation very cheaply fulfilled. The most limited command of a few terms will satisfy the requirements of general society. Half-a-dozen technical words, judiciously and sparingly employed, will leave a general impression of technical knowledge. It does not require a more than ordinary readiness to talk knowingly before an audience, who know as little or less of the subject as the speaker himself. But it is another matter when a dilettante Agriculturist finds himself standing up to tell their own business, or to trot out his own hobbies to a roomful of hard-headed, hard-handed farmers, fresh from the daily work and study of their lives. A ready, skilful speaker will boldly face or gracefully avoid the difficulty of his position, and, however little he may have to say, his speech will always be worth listening to, and will be welcomed. He will dress up his ideas in such picturesque colours, and in such a flowing garb, that his audience will fail to recognise them as old worn-out acquaintances. But ordinary men have no such resources. Though they must speak about farming, they dare not talk to farmers; and they have no other refuge than safe and vague Agricultural generalities, and up to these they submissively and unhesitatingly render themselves. This will account for the fact that among the reports of the meetings which flooded the columns of the newspapers in the autumn, there was so little positive information to be gathered.

It is not our purpose, nor should we presume, to attempt any examination of the actual advance which these numerous meetings and associations seem to point to. That a stimulus has been applied, and that there has been an unsettling of old received notions, and that important elements of change have been infused, and that the movement which has begun is progressive, and in the main a real one, there can be no manner of question. Nor are the interests involved confined to the farming community. A wide-spread movement of this nature, even though its immediate objects are commercial and material, cannot be indifferent to the Church. The whole nation, too, have a direct interest in the productions of the farmer. The better the farmer, the greater returns he gets from his land and his stock. The more

abundant his produce, the cheaper our food. A good sample of wheat and high cultivation imply a plentiful yield and cheap bread. A breed of stock, which is capable of being fatted at an early age, and in a short period, and with a low consumption, implies beef and mutton at a moderate price. But beyond this very obvious connexion between the welfare of the farmer and that of the rest of the population, there were some one or two special topics started by various speakers, which have a more extended bearing than upon the local audiences before whom they were delivered.

Foremost amongst them is one which has already attracted a vast amount of careful thought—that is, a more general application of sewage to Agricultural purposes. The subject is not an inviting one; it has to do with the more business-like and the grosser part of rural occupations; its direct bearing is technical and scientific, but indirectly it claims the attention of all who are concerned in the matter of cleanliness and health. The often-quoted proverb, that ‘muck is money,’ may be unsavoury; but it forcibly represents a great Agricultural idea, and points to the true solution of a great sanatory problem. It is beginning to be recognised that the sewage of our towns is not what it has hitherto been supposed—only a nuisance to be got rid of, and a fruitful source of disease, and a convenient and comprehensive cause to which to refer all forms of endemic sickness, whose origin was not immediately traceable—but men are opening their understandings to the fact that it contains fertilizing properties of almost inexhaustible Agricultural wealth. All the object which we have in introducing the question into these pages is to point out the fact that it is occupying the minds of thoughtful and practical men, that its introduction among the more exhausted topics of after-dinner Agricultural oratory is a token that it will not long remain unsolved, and that in its solution the whole of the community have an interest hardly less direct than that of the farmers themselves. Those who have studied the habits of the country poor, and observed the domestic ways which prevail in many country villages, cannot but feel that there is great room for reform in this particular, and cannot but be prepared to welcome any movement which appears to promise reformation.

The standing illustration of the evils of the now departing system of drainage, and the most obtrusive and telling one is, of course, the condition of the Thames, and the stench which for one or two summers in succession it inflicted generally and diffusively upon the inhabitants of London, and with more virulent and concentrated intensity upon those unhappy Members of Parliament, whom a sense of duty or the ties of office kept

to their posts for the last six weeks of the session. The lot which placed the Houses upon the banks of the river, and opened the windows of the committee-rooms over the very waters of the reeking stream, so that not an odour wafted up from the mass of pollution below was lost to sweeten the labours of drawing up a report, or deciding between the claims of rival railway litigants, may have given vigour and direction to the treatment which the subject is undergoing, and hastened the discovery of some remedy, or a mitigation of the infliction. If so, the last and the present House of Commons have not deserved ill of their country. To inhale more atrocious smells, and to breathe a more poisonous atmosphere than their constituents, was an honour to which they would not willingly have devoted themselves. But having endured it, and the nuisance being about to be abated, through their involuntary sufferings, let them have credit for their patriotism.

It is not, however, in the metropolis alone, nor in the other great cities, that the eyes and noses and every delicate organ of the inhabitants have suffered at one time or another from the accumulation of sewage. The abomination is as intolerable in its degree in country towns and isolated villages. In the North and South there are many little knots of cottages, with their parish church a stone's-throw above them, clustering on the side of a hill, or lining for a quarter of a mile an ascent in the high road, where the traveller may see on one side of him or on both a little streamlet of clear water, perhaps only a foot wide, running down between the footpath and the road. How picturesque and fresh the effect is, no one can have failed to mark. This is the poetical and ideal conception of rustic cleanliness, and in many villages it is fully realized. But often the reality is something very different. Instead of the little stream, the gutter by the side is occupied by a mass of blueish or dull brown liquid, trickling slowly from house to house. At certain hours of the day, or on certain days of the week, when the sink or the wash-tub are executing their respective functions, a tribute is welling out from the drain-head of every cottage in the row. And now and then an excited and bare-armed mother of a family will make a dash out of her door, and toss the uninviting contents of her tub into the open sewer. Very little of all this necessary abomination is carried away, or has any place prepared for its reception. What does not sink into the ground, or does not evaporate, or is not absorbed into the atmosphere and lungs of the inhabitants, or does not form itself into stagnant pools by the road-side, finds its way at last into some natural cesspool, as much exposed to the air as the drain itself. This is no uncommon picture of country drainage, where the village

is not in the hands of one or two wealthy resident proprietors. There is no one to organize a better system. The clergyman has either more pressing duties, or from want of means and substantial legal authority cannot enforce cleaner habits. He feels how closely morality and self-respect are bound up with cleanliness. But he is practically helpless. Domestic purification is a delicate matter for an individual to interfere in. He perhaps alone, of all the inhabitants of his secluded village, is conscious that there is any need of reform; and he alone suffers, and suffers in compulsory inaction. The cottagers themselves are not so much to blame. They do not know how to get rid of their sewage, and as the most natural means, they throw it or drain it out of their cottage doors. Let it once be ascertained that all this has a marketable value, and let cheap and simple means of utilizing it be discovered, and it cannot be long before the unsightly and unseemly state of things of which country villages afford so many examples, will vanish and be forgotten. It is already fast decreasing, and being replaced by sounder sanitary and economical arrangements. We do not ask for pretty effects. The conditions under which they are possible are necessarily rare; but we trust before long many villages will be able to adopt remunerative, and consequently decent and healthy, systems of drainage.

The limit which we see to the return which the farmer may expect from his labours, lies not in any want of appliances, nor in any lack of energy in his uses of them, but in the productive capacities of the earth. We believe that husbandry will become more enterprising and more scientific, that culture will be higher, that the use of manure will be more generous, and that it will be gathered from continually fresh and increasing sources; that every available appliance—chemical, mechanical, and commercial—will be put in request; but we very much question whether corn-growing can be made much more profitable than at present. Artificial nourishment can never compete with the richness of nature. Every acre, almost, of land in England has been so severely taxed, has had to submit to such grinding and exhausting exactions, that very few of its productive properties are its own inherently. If any one doubts this, let him sow wheat on a piece of ordinary land for four years in succession, without giving back anything to the soil, and mark the result the fourth year. Fruits and corn can, indeed, be forced to greater perfection, and in greater abundance, than nature under the most favourable conditions will yield; but this cannot be done on a larger scale, and, what is more to the point, it cannot be done profitably. It is a mere truism to say that rich virgin soil will always repay cultivation better than from long-used

land under high artificial dressing. We doubt if Mr. Mechi's model farm yields him as fine a crop as the new wheat-lands reclaimed from the sea on the Eastern coast—pay him equally it certainly cannot. After all, progressive Agriculture resolves itself into a question of profit and loss. Immediately improvements cease to be remunerative, and high farming comes to be synonymous with high expenditure and low receipts; then, except as a fancy and with amateurs, progress will inevitably stop short. That point, it seems to us, may very soon be reached, although Mr. Gladstone gave it as his opinion to the farmers of Flintshire that Agriculture is still in a state of infancy.

It is extremely difficult to get at any accurate statistics of the quality of wheat grown in the kingdom, or of the number of arable acres. But, taking 28 bushels as the average yield per acre,—this, produced every three or four years, would give a return of 8 bushels grown each year to each acre. In other words, the number of acres under the plough, represents the number of quarters of wheat annually produced. Now, whether by more scientific husbandry, or by a more lavish use of artificial manure, or by the application of sewage, or any means of natural fertilization, or by any discoveries in the process of cultivation, or in the samples of seed cultivated—this average can be materially and profitably increased, either by the yield being higher or the number of acres greater, is the point in which all subsidiary questions on corn-growing meet. The increase of wheat-growing land, in England at any rate, can hardly be a disturbing element in the calculation. When it is taken into account that the passion for inclosing, which raged some few years back, has very much subsided, having necessarily limited the field of its available action; and that the acres of arable land every year laid down as grass; and that the constant enclosure and enlargement of pleasure-grounds and parks; and that the vast area daily covered by buildings, go far to balance the districts reclaimed from the sea, and the wastes, and heaths, and marshes brought from time to time into cultivation,—it would seem that there is a compensating process at work which will keep the acreage of arable land at a rate almost stationary. With respect to the yield, it would seem capable of an almost indefinite increase, but not at an increasing profit. And for this reason. It may, or may not, be found that the outlay of high farming mounts up faster than the return; but it must be that the competition of imported corn in the market will be sharper, and under less and less favourable conditions to the English grower. We base this opinion—not upon the imports which are already poured in, and which may reasonably be expected to increase, from the

Black Sea, or from Egypt, or from any of the German or Baltic ports—but upon the enormous and apparently limitless supplies which the almost untouched lands of the States of North-western America seem destined to yield for the food of man. In classical times, the Valley of the Nile was the granary of the world. In future times it seems likely to be the Valley of the Upper Mississippi, and the plains watered by its tributaries. By some careful and apparently reliable calculations made on the spot by Mr. Trollope, in the autumn of 1861, the amount of grain received and passed through Buffalo during that year, reached the inconceivable quantity of 60,000,000 bushels. The cereal wealth of those regions is something which cannot be conveyed to the mind by figures. It made an impression upon the writer which he has graphically conveyed:—

‘I was at Chicago and at Buffalo in October, 1861. I went down to the granaries, and climbed up into the elevators. I saw the wheat running in rivers from one vessel into another, and from the railroad vans up into the larger bins on the top story of the warehouses—for these rivers of food run up-hill as easily as they do down. I saw the corn measured by the 40-bushel measure, with as much ease as we measure an ounce of cheese, and with greater rapidity. I ascertained that the work went on week-day and Sunday, day and night incessantly—rivers of wheat, and rivers of maize ever running. I saw the men bathed in corn as they distributed it in its flow. I saw bins by the score laden with wheat, in each of which bins there was room for a comfortable residence. I breathed the flour, and drank the flour, and felt myself to be enveloped in a world of breadstuff. And then I believed, understood, and brought it home to myself, that here in the corn-lands of Michigan, and amid the bluffs of Wisconsin, and on the high table-lands of Minnesota, and the prairies of Illinois,—had God prepared the food for the increasing millions of the Eastern world, as also for the coming millions of the Western.’

These lands, for the most part, are virgin soil. The earth is teeming and luxurious. It requires no cleaning, no draining, no dressing; for Nature herself has been fertilizing it, during the thousands of years it has remained untilled. The climate is most propitious; but a fraction of the whole has yet been brought under tillage; labour will always be attainable; the materials for transit are at hand, and require only application and development; and here it is, amid this rude abundance, this prodigal and lavish wealth of Nature, that, we think, we detect the obstacle to any great advance in the profits of corn-growing by a higher culture at home. The cost of a bushel of corn last year in Illinois—we are still relying upon Mr. Trollope—was 10 cents.; by the time it reached Liverpool, its cost was 3s. 10d. Indian corn is of inferior quality and value to wheat, and will never much disturb the market price of the latter. What the price of wheat was in the States which grow it, we do not know. But in the autumn of the year before last, when a

considerable proportion of the population had been draughted away for the purposes of the war, and when the Mississippi was blockaded, in some places wheat was so abundant that it would not pay for the labour of gathering, or if gathered, it was used as fuel. The original cost, even in settled times, must be something very low. The relative prices of Indian corn in Illinois and Liverpool will give the carriage from the corn-growing districts to England; and that is at the excessive rate of eight-ninths of the gross value when imported. Of this freight, the ocean-passage consumes half, and that will not, probably, be diminished. But when these States come to be more thickly populated, and when the Americans have time to devote themselves to the opening out of the internal resources of this country, and to establish, as they inevitably will do, a less circuitous inland route from the prairies to the sea, it seems difficult to avoid the conclusion, that no improved system of husbandry here will be able to compete, with an increasing profit, or even with a profit so steady as at present, with importations from the Western Continent. The consumption of the population of England is something enormously in advance of its cereal produce; and this, while it will create a greater demand for corn, and will keep up the profits of the grower, will, at the same time, attract the superfluous productions of other countries. And, however well founded may be the expectations, and however buoyant the hopes of Agricultural reformers, they can hardly look forward to the increase of corn grown keeping pace with the increase of consumers. So that, the quantity of land under cultivation remaining constant, or nearly so, and the consumption of corn rising year by year, and not being met by a proportionately increasing yield, we shall have to depend more and more upon foreign imports. And an impetus being once given to the already vast growth and trade of the wheat-fields of the North-Western States, and the transit of grain being facilitated and cheapened, our farmers will find that the most enlightened and beneficial culture bestowed upon their long-enduring fields, will do no more than enable them to maintain their own against the teeming and lavish wealth of the Western prairies, even when freighted with the cost of a long land and ocean passage.

There were few topics which were dwelt upon with more complacency, or which obtained, and deserved, a more prominent position in the speeches at the autumnal meetings, than the improvement which has set in in stock-breeding. And if the names of those who give the weight and sanction of their presence on the platform, or who are marked, not unfrequently, as victors in the prize-list, can be taken as evidence, it exercises a fascination no less clerical than lay. So far as this was a

kindred pursuit with corn-growing, and was carried on by the same class, it was long at a stand still. Graziers and breeders were always a sharper race, and more given to experiment, than the tillers of the ground, and they had been constantly advancing with fair success. But it is only of very late years that the subject—or the art, as it may justly be entitled—has made any marked progress, and has been recognised as an essential part of their business by the farmers themselves. Breeding is a more subtle and scientific matter than is generally supposed. It requires a knowledge of animal physiology, and an amount of experience, and an acuteness of observation, and a minute and comprehensive judgment, and a capacity for patience and perseverance, which are said to be united in not more than half-a-dozen men in the kingdom. It is a strange power of control for man to exercise, which can curb the caprices of nature, check the wonted growth in one part of an animal, and develop an unwonted one in another—which can lengthen this limb, and shorten that—give breadth and solidity here, and firmness there—which can lay on bulk on one quarter, and divest a tendency to size from another—which can hasten the period of maturity, and give a more delicate quality to every joint of the carcase; and all this without marring the shape, or impairing the health, or in any way impeding the freedom of the animal; but, on the contrary, bestowing upon it a robuster and a more fully-developed system, and moulding its proportions into an admirable symmetry. The popular part of an agricultural show is always the cattle-shed. And, especially if the show includes one of pigeons or of poultry, to give a colouring to their attendance, the exhibition attracts not a few of the gentler sex. The presence of ladies will be accepted as a tribute to the success of the exhibitors: but the effect is certainly odd to see the tips of delicately-gloved fingers giving a professional pinch to the sleek, level ribs of a ponderous meek-eyed, wondering, prize-ticketed ox. Experimental breeding is an expensive and somewhat aristocratic pastime; and cattle-shows, like other country-life tendencies of the day, are a passing fashion. But making allowances for the high-flown compliments which are involved in all public proceedings, which happen for the moment to be the rage, and the pardonable eulogistic tone of congratulation which is offered to, and complacently accepted by, the successful competitors, there is a solid and ascertainable result reached in breeding, of which its promoters may well be proud. The lean, rough-coated, stunted, and leggy animals, which may be passed in droves in the outskirts of any country town when a fair is being held, are the materials upon which they had to work—the broad, straight-backed, compact, glossy short-born, with a

pedigree, and half-a-dozen prize-medals, and the price of 1,000 guineas set upon him, is the result to which they have attained. By what processes this has been brought about, and what is the mode and field of operation at the present time, and what further results may reasonably be calculated upon, and to what extent the balance-sheet of the farmer is or will be affected, are questions too technical and too confined in their interest to find a place here. It is not sufficiently considered that most of the men who carry away prizes as exhibitors of cattle, are men of position and wealth, who follow the pursuit as an amusement, or for the benefit of their tenants, and whose fancy-farming can be no safe criterion in estimating the results to practical husbandry. One of the obvious duties of a landlord, and one which is being more and more accepted and acted upon, is to take the lead in experiments, and to reduce to practice the sober and well-grounded theories of scientific agriculturists, who may not have the means or opportunity of testing them themselves. It is only by the example and instrumentality of land-owners that the various difficult questions which are now floating about unsolved, and disturbing the evenness of the agricultural mind, can be satisfactorily determined, and brought to a definite issue. In this way, the nobleman who bears away a medal for his prize-heifer, is an indirect benefactor to the whole farming community, though his own outlay may be, and probably is, out of all proportion to his positive and direct receipts. A long time must elapse before the standard of the breed of cattle throughout the kingdom can be permanently and generally raised. In the rapidly-increasing generations of domestic animals, the blood of a high stock is very quickly diffused. It permeates through neighbouring grazing-grounds, and is transmitted gradually from flock to flock; but it will not be among the existing generation of farmers, even if it ever takes place, that a low type of animal will be the exception and not the rule.

All the thorough-bred horses in the kingdom, and probably half the rest kept for personal use, trace their descent in a direct line, or collaterally, from a couple of Arabian sires imported into this country two centuries ago. And no doubt the high rank and price which English horses maintain in Europe is due, in a great degree, to them, and to the care bestowed upon their progeny. But there are as many screws, and weedy and low-bred animals in our own stables as in our neighbours'. So it will be with the breeds of sheep and cattle. Every stock-yard will not be renovated all at once, nor upon every outlying farm in the land. The result which has been gained in breeding since it was taken up, is not to be depreciated; but there can hardly be a hope that as much will

be done in the next half-century as has been done in the last. In the revival of any long-neglected branch of art or industry, the first movement, though not leaving behind it the most lasting results, is the most effective and prominent, and of the widest range, impresses itself most strongly upon the imagination of the promoters, and creates an ill-founded expectation that all future progress will advance with the same vast strides. It seems to us that unless the theory of continual and boundless improvement by natural selection can be maintained, nature must set a limit somewhere to the further development of her animal species. The flesh and frame of an animal cannot be submitted to the same infinite modifications and refinements as the flavour of a peach, or the form of a rose. In horse-breeding that limit has not improbably been reached. The horses of the turf, around whose name and fame the highest prestige has gathered, are not horses of this day. For powers of endurance, for the ordinary purposes of carrying a full-grown man, for beauty and strength of body, the model modern racer is deteriorating. He has to be forced into an unnatural maturity; his honours, if he be destined to gain any, must be won while he is still a colt; at four years old he is practically superannuated. The exquisite lithe, finely-drawn, high-bred, long-legged creature, which at two years old will carry a feather-weight over a half-mile course in some infinitesimal number of seconds, is a rare triumph of art; but it is of an art which, except for some special racing purposes, has over-reached itself. Cattle-breeding, which is less a matter of sport or fancy, and more of commerce, is not exposed to quite the same temptations. But the barriers beyond which it cannot be economically and profitably carried, are not more extended, nor less rigid and insurmountable.

In truth, the rosy hues in which the promotion and sustinment of progressive Agriculture paint their near and distant prospect, require toning down in the gaze of more dispassionate observers. The unaccustomed sensation of taking part in an industrial reformation has disturbed the flow of ideas, which were wont to percolate with a gentle current through the farmer's mind. But this agitation will find its own level, and adapt itself somehow to old habits and modes of thought. All the disquieting elements which, in a period of abrupt change following close upon a long interval of rest, rush to the surface, will be absorbed, and the passion for invention will subside. And if in the interim, some unchecked flights of fancy, some impracticable hopes, some golden but inexplicable theories tinge the schemes and calculations of the future, they must be set down to the pardonable freaks of an imagination indulging in the

novel delight of stretching its young wings. The first attempt to soar of a caged-bird set free, will always be eccentric, and wild and high and exultant will be its first cry of freedom.

If anything would bring about that collapse of the constitution with which we are so often threatened, it would be the unsettling and scattering of all those steady qualities which are thought to be attendant upon the pursuit of husbandry. But we detect no signs of an approaching revolution in the Agricultural commonwealth. However enterprising and progressive, the inherent conditions of farming will ever be much as they are. The past and the present, custom and circumstance, will always exercise a strong influence upon the farmer. A thorough-paced, uncompromising reformer lives in the future. The past, with its experience, is an incumbrance which harasses him. The present, with its dependence upon common matter-of-fact bearings, with its coldness and its obstructions, with its reverence for things as they have been, and its contentment with things as they are, is wearisome and impeding to his ardent spirit. But husbandry, from its nature, and from the character with which it invariably invests those who follow it, is essentially a steady, jog-trot pursuit. Its conditions are such as cannot be hurried nor anticipated, nor set on one side. Unlike manufactures, it is less dependent upon man's invention and art than upon Nature, and, like Nature, its operations must be orderly and periodical, and rigidly systematic. It is guarded from the gambling and uncertainty, and consequent bustle and excitement, attendant upon all branches of manufacturing industry. It is freed from their risks, and from their profit too. A farmer cannot become rich, nor be ruined in a single year, nor by a prosperous venture. His proceeds are subject to easy and tolerably regular fluctuations, not to violent ones. And thus it is, that while in almost all other trades large fortunes are made, a wealthy farmer is so great a rarity. Other kindred trades can be, and are most advantageously combined with it; but it is seldom that husbandry alone bestows great wealth upon those engaged upon it. It makes men substantial and well-to-do, and of comfortable circumstances, and so on, but rarely rich. And this arises quite as much from the nature of their business, as from their manner of working it. It is taken up now by more energetic men, and on a larger scale, and embraces a more extended range, and commands all improved modern means and appliances, but its original intrinsic conditions remain unaltered.

The question which arises, and which is one of interest to all readers—and especially to country clergymen, who are so much personally concerned, is this:—Will the farmers themselves remain unaltered? It will be replied,—It is not desirable that

they should. An answer with which, so long as it takes for granted that all change implies improvement, we cordially agree. It is said that the spirit of emulation is at the root of all progress and excellence. This principle, then, is beginning to operate on a class whom experience has taught us to regard as eminently free from ambition, and averse to alteration—qualities which are not without their charm, but which are always liable to degenerate into indolence and stolidity. Their long conservative quiet has now been dispelled, and its smooth surface ruffled; and, though the agitation is spreading into remote and long-dormant corners, and its pulsations are beginning to be felt far and wide, we cannot think that the calmness of Agricultural life will be permanently broken up, or even disturbed to any very great depth. We read of progress, and of never-ceasing experiments, and of marvellous achievements; but we do not notice that the tenant-farmers around us, in our parish, or in our neighbourhood, are diverging from their old path, hastening their cautious, steady pace, or ruffling the even tenor of their way. And why should they? Let them be as enlightened as you will, and as well-educated as their position demands, but who shall say that they will be happier or more prosperous, better citizens, better churchmen, better Christians, if this spirit of ambition is infused into their hearts, and they begin to conceive that their highest duty in life is to surpass the products of their neighbours, and carry off a medal at the County meeting? Those whose calling has brought them much into contact with tenant-farmers, may wish that their ideas were more liberal and enlarged; but they would miss many elements of stability and constancy—much upon which they have been wont steadfastly to rely—if half the meddlesome schemes of platform reformers were adopted and worked out. It is well for great landowners and men of wealth to devote their money and opportunities to progressive Agriculture; the result of every success of theirs finds its way downwards, and influences the operations of the poorest cottar, who spends his savings and the evening of his life in tilling a score of acres. But we should grieve if we thought that any movement onwards would smother those inherent characteristics of the farmer to which time and habit have so long accustomed us. The ever-present influence of his daily occupation will counteract the unsettling efforts of periodical agitation. Constant contact with the soil and with dumb animals, a settled routine of unexciting work, tend to create a staidness of demeanor, and a placid contentment, and a freedom from ambition and parade, which the consciousness of taking part in the great scientific and practical advance of the age, and the pride of an unwonted achievement

or an occasional triumph, can never thoroughly obliterate. And we rejoice that it is so. We rejoice to see difficulties overcome, and we sympathize with successes achieved in Agriculture; but we rejoice, too, that in the midst of the innovating and agitating elements which pervade the constitution of society in the present age, there is a solid promise of stability and security in the qualities which experience has hitherto proved inseparable from the pursuit of husbandry.

A topic which, more than any of the preceding ones, appeals to general sympathies, touches upon interests which are national rather than confined to a single class, raises questions of political and moral import rather than commercial and material, and which serves to justify the introduction of the subject into this Review, is the condition and prospects of the Agricultural poor. Among the various branches of their inquiry, which have puzzled the minds and taxed the benevolent energies of Agricultural Reformers, none can show less tangible results, or has reached a less satisfactory position. The social and intellectual state of farm-labourers being found at a low ebb, it was not unreasonable that men who formed associations for mutual assistance in raising the standard of the cultivation of corn and the breed of cattle, should take in hand the amelioration of those who actually till the ground and tend the flocks. All things seem practicable and of easy accomplishment to Societies. The delicacies and the obstacles which frighten men in their individual capacity, vanish when they find themselves collected in a body, and acting through a committee, and a secretary, and a string of resolutions, and a printed report. In a matter which requires gentleness and tact, the action of a body of men is seldom to be trusted. As the tyranny of a mob is more vexatious and oppressive than that of an individual, and its cruelty more relentless; so in matters where the heart is concerned, it runs into equal extremes—it overlooks all niceties and delicate shades of feeling, it expresses its emotions coarsely and unreasonably, and hence its heroes or its victims generally but half deserve its affection or its hatred. In high constitutional assemblies there are many checks to balance the inevitable defects of collective action. But with nearly all irresponsible, self-elected bodies, there is a vein of hardness, and often of injustice, pervading their working towards individuals. The habit of generalising, and regarding their fellow-creatures in masses, as objects for political and economical experiment, as beings to be lumped together for some philanthropical scheme, which assumes that all men have the same wants and aspirations, is sure to beget a corresponding habit of indifference and callousness to individual feeling. Even religious societies, whether

missionary, or for the purposes of spiritual aid, or the relief of destitution at home, are tainted with the same failing. It is engrained in their very constitution. Whatever may be gained in impartiality and completeness, and efficiency of organization, charity is never less charitable than when associated. No one can question the benevolence of the intentions of the gentlemen and farmers who form the various Agricultural Societies, in taking under their protection and patronage the cause of the labouring poor; but one cannot read many of the speeches which the matter has called forth, without coming to the conclusion that, however elevating may be their object, the means and the processes are debasing. We are told that, to whatever objections Agricultural Societies have at various times been exposed, all meet now at one point, and that is, the practice of giving a reward to those labourers who, they say 'have a claim upon their recognition and respect from their long services.' That practice, where it is still maintained, we hold to be most detrimental and pernicious. A society has not a very keen eye for an absurdity, but ridicule has ever swept away more abuses than reason; and, perhaps, the custom has received as severe a shock from the handle, which the childishness of the prize often bestowed, has afforded to adverse criticism, as from its own folly and vicious principle. But, whether the paltry prize by which a man is recompensed for having spent the prime of his life, and worn away the flower of his strength upon one master, be a rational or a ridiculous one, does not affect the general system. To bestow a worthless decoration or prize upon another man's servant for long and meritorious service is immoral in principle, no less than a most unwarrantable interference. It defeats the purpose of its promoters, which, so far as the abstract success or failure of any particular plan is concerned, is of comparatively little moment; but when the plan embraces the interests of a large, widely-diffused class, it acquires an importance beyond itself. It enters upon a province in which the Church has a deep and responsible stake—that, namely, of enlightening and raising a section of the poor of the land. This individual practice may or may not do any marked mischief, but it discloses the tone which their new patrons assume towards Agricultural labourers. The rule itself has not wanted able and consistent advocates. But of the two arguments which alone can be adduced in its favour, one contains a transparent fallacy, the other is avowedly one of expediency. To argue, as men have argued, till the ground was cut from under their feet—that the possession of a hat with variegated ribbons was coveted as eagerly by the veteran ploughman as the Victoria Cross, or the ribbon of the Bath is by the soldier, and that it reflects as

high honour upon the possessor—is to confuse things radically distinct. It is difficult to give an accurate definition of what constitutes the honour of any reward; but there is no denial of the fact that some do confer honour and some do not. An officer gains his medal, not for having served his country so many years, but for some definite act of courage, or endurance, or promptitude. And the medal or the ribbon is the gift of the Sovereign, and as such, by universal custom and common consent, has a chivalrous value attached to it, which it would utterly lose if it were presented by the chairman of a society for the promotion of military valour. Many testimonials are open to the same objections. That a man's friends, when he leaves behind him deep feelings of gratitude and affection, should wish to give him some memorial of the closeness of the tie which had connected him with them, is a pleasing and irreproachable desire. But the promiscuous habit of presenting a clergyman with an inkstand just as a matter of course, because so many months or years of his life have been passed in a certain parish, and which is generally the work of half-a-dozen consequential busybodies, comes very nearly into the same category of impertinence and ostentatious patronage, as that of rewarding a farm-labourer for his long service.

Another reason put forward in favour of the practice is, that it has worked well these last twenty years, 'that the rewards are sought after most eagerly, and duly appreciated by the labourers of the land.' In other words, whatever objections may be urged against them on principle, let them be continued—because they gratify the recipients. And this is the way to create a feeling of self-respect among the peasantry, raise their moral tone, and discipline and instruct and refine them! After parading the low state of their mental and physical organization, after dilating upon their incapacity for self-government and self-improvement, it is thought that the only high means of eliciting some powers of self-culture, and striking some sparks of a purer ambition in their breasts, is to dangle before their eyes just those showy and childish rewards which their unformed instincts, so obtrusively insisted upon, would naturally delight in! If an Agricultural labourer is to win a prize for long services, why should not associations be formed for the purpose of rewarding every class of servant? and where is the limit to be fixed? If a labourer, why not a footman?—and why not a shopman's assistant? And why not go up and up till a body of benevolent bankers bestow, with great parade and ostentation, upon every clerk within a certain area, who has grown grey-headed in his employer's service, a box of gold pens, as a reward for having spent his life's energies for one man's benefit, and to

encourage others to do the same? Will it stimulate the industry and excite the ambition of a plough-boy, to be told that if he does his work well, and is honest, and marries a wife, and brings up a family, and keeps clear of the squire's preserves, and goes occasionally to church, and does not change his master, that he may hope, at the end of half a century, to be summoned before a tableful of gentlemen, to receive from their august hands a brand-new half-sovereign, to the approval and admiration of his neighbours and his grandchildren? In point of fact, the cause is a weak one, and sooner or later it must be given up. It is adhered to now with some pertinacity, as men will cling to their time-honoured hobbies and exploded schemes, and not the less rigidly when they are assailed by rude and merciless criticism. So far as a labourer shows skill or experience in his special employment, let him be encouraged and incited by emulation and by publicity. Let the hedger, or the ploughman, or the thatcher, be brought into competition with his neighbours of the same craft, and if he can lay or trim a neater or compacter hedge; if he can put a more artistic covering upon a stack; if he can drive a furrow straighter and more uniform—give him a prize, as you would his master, or his master's landlord. But do not insult his faithful and toilsome years of service by some totally inadequate and even contemptible recompense.

We confess that there is to us something grating and unsympathetic in the general tone and demeanor of Agricultural Societies towards their labourers. They are a class which were long overlooked and trodden-down. English philanthropy is always active and always seeking for fresh and more attractive objects of compassion. It is now years since, roaming the world for new fields of enterprise, tired of alleviating the hardships of the negro abroad and the grievance of the convict at home, philanthropists caught up and set to work upon the farm labourer. And since that time he has been dragged before the world, and been set up as the patient butt for all the odd charitable shafts of reformers and theorists. All, at one time or another, experience what it is to have friends who take too active an interest in our welfare—who have always in hand some pet plan of their own for managing our own concerns—who are always laying some well-meant traps and throwing out cords to control and check our own preferences and independent action—till their kindness becomes positively irritating and their bonds galling, and the victim breaks loose and finds relief in coldness and absence. If ever a hedger and ditcher occupies his solitary hours in analysing his feelings, he must be sometimes driven to the conclusion that he is overwhelmed by the goodness of his well-wishers and patrons. There are two

extreme points of view from which the labourer is regarded at the present day—and, like other extravagant notions, either has some faint resemblance to the true conception which it exaggerates; but both will be resented by all who live in rural parishes, and who have been brought into contact with the minds of those who form the bulk of rural congregations, and who are conversant with rural manners and customs. One of these surrounds him with a poetical atmosphere—fancying freedom from care, and frugal contentment, and a toil-less routine of genial occupation, and ceaseless whistling, to be the normal and inalienable conditions of his life. It concludes that because some of his duties are light and pretty, and because now and then he is lighthearted—because a plough-boy is never tired of giving out a couple of bars of a popular air the whole morning he is driving his team; and because a group of men and women listlessly tossing about fresh-mown grass on a July afternoon, or the three or four generations of an entire village sitting in rows over their huge baskets in a hop-garden in September, is a picturesque scene—therefore, every operation of rustic labour is romantic, and has an exhilarating effect upon the spirits of every man, woman, and child so occupied. This view, though ideal and unreal, is harmless enough. The other, which is a rebound from and a protest against this, is not a whit more in accordance with facts or nature, and is more positively harmful. It represents the Agricultural peasantry as a race wanting in all fine instincts, and with brutish habits, and stolid, and emotionless, and immoral. It pretends to offer a rational, matter-of-fact account of them, and to scatter the haze of poetry through which men have been taught to look at them. What can you expect the social condition of a family to be, who maintain, without sympathy or support, a struggling fight against starvation upon nine or ten shillings a-week, eked out by the miserable pittance which the mother or boys are able to add at rare intervals to the common scanty stock, and living in a wretched hovel, huddled together day and night in two or, at the most, three rooms, in contempt of all cleanliness, decency, and morality? What can you expect the intellectual condition of a man to be, whose home, when he reaches it after his day's work is done, is so uninviting, and whose mind has been intent upon the clods which, from the sunrise almost till the winter evening closes in, his plough has been turning up; whose nature is debased by unvarying contact with heavy irrational animals, and by the filthy and gross occupations which his daily duties expose him to? What opportunity can a man's frame have for physical health and development, whose work drives him out into the open air on all days and at all seasons, exposed with the thinnest amount of

clothing, and with few of those powers of resistance which plentiful and nourishing food supply to the system, to the extremes of heat and cold and wet, and the onslaughts of rheumatism and low fever? The man whose ways of life are such, and whose forefathers for generations back have passed through the same circumstances, can be little better than a hind or a serf; and if we wish to reclaim and to raise him, we must treat him as such, and proceed with our experiments accordingly. Now, against this view, which is only too general—though it contains some elements of truth—we emphatically protest. It is specious and plausible, and wears an appearance of unqualified candour. Like many other common-sense accounts of a thing, as they are called, it is exaggerated and one-sided. It suppresses all extenuating or refining conditions, and after all jumps at a conclusion which the premises do not warrant. To us—and we utter what we believe must be the opinion of all whose position or duty has placed them in the country—the English peasant, though his life has little enough of the romance with which many would invest it, has a very different aspect to that presented of him above. We do not deny that he undergoes much misery in his career. A labourer at fifty has done an amount of work, and has submitted to privations and hardships which would have laid low a less robust and accommodating constitution. He has few comforts, mental or material, to cheer his declining years. His life may close in the Union, or its end may be hastened by poverty, or by the development of any one of those numerous ills of which a life-long exposure has accumulated the seeds in his body. He leaves no successes nor triumphs behind him; he lives and he dies as his father lived and died before him, and he has no reasonable hope that his son will do otherwise after him. What we call prosperity has never shined upon his labours. Day after day, from morning till night, he has had to stand up and fight the hard battle of bare existence; and what wonder if, when he succumbs at last, his frame is battered, and his spirit broken, and the spark of his intellect burns dimly and faint. What wonder if enterprise and ambition have never entered into the narrow circle of his ideas, and that his thoughts have seldom ranged beyond the unvarying present. Shall we call him clownish and stolid, and speak slightingly of his faithful plodding industry? Was not his mission in the world to work with his hands? And has he not worked till those hands drop nerveless at his side, and that body is bent double? What wonder that a taste for refinement, and that restless longing to push upward, from which few are free, have found no place in his dull hard existence. The poetry of Nature has no voice for him. His hands handle her soil, and

his home is in her fields, and his lot is to be her fellow-worker ; but for him her face is lighted up by no smiles, her aspect wears no ever-changing lines and hues of beauty, she stirs no deep unaccountable emotions of his heart ; she is only to him a constant monitor of his pressing need to work, and ever to work. And is there nothing to respect and admire ? is there no worth, no submissive contentment—ay, and no dignity, no piety—in his interminable work ? Call it, if you will, a dull, poor-spirited, wearisome lot ; but, because he has bowed to his lot, and laboriously plods along his inevitable track, do not cast a slur upon his honest industry, and brand him grovelling and brutish. It is a lot which brings compensations with it, which those outside his sphere little dream of. His imagination, it may be, is feeble and dormant—it may strike no poetry out of the scenes he is daily moving amongst. But, unconsciously to himself, the calm influences of Nature in her homely material aspect, and the necessity of incessant occupation, create in him a placid contentment, which to the restless busy world above him may seem sluggish and inert, but which guards his life from the irritation and the excitement, the ceaseless rivalry and the exhausting wear and tear, which a more striving career involves. The mysterious properties of air and soil, and the marvellous processes of reproduction, are secrets whose existence is hardly suspected by him ; but he works on in simple trust, confiding not in science, nor in a chain of efficient causes, but in unfailing experience. Thus his work becomes a part of himself, it assumes a prominence among the facts of his existence, and enters indissolubly into his duty and religion. He is no machine, no slave chained down to a mechanical routine. Dreary and saddening may be his endless work, but he is able to stamp it in a degree with his own character, and make it bear the impress of his own way of doing it. Men are ready enough to sing the praises and court the favour of those who carve out great fortunes, or force their way upward in society ; but no notice is too contemptuous for those whose life has slipped away, steadfastly doing their duty to God and man in the position in which they were placed. Yet the often-heard boast of a village patriarch—‘For five-and-forty years I worked on that farm, even since I was no higher than my hand’—carries with it as true a pathos, and is founded on grounds as just, as the complacent self-congratulation of any whose ambition in the world has been ever to rise. The old labourer’s ideas, and perhaps experience, never revolved beyond the bounds of that secluded hamlet. There he was born ; in that cottage his life has glided away ; and in that quiet churchyard he hopes his body will rest. But what a tale does that half-century of peaceful and

uneventful toil unfold! What an amount of solid labour, what patience, what industry, what physical exhaustion, what an expenditure of vital forces and animal strength, since the day when he first learnt to crack his whip, and tyrannize with youthful audacity over his huge, docile plough-team, till the time when his last day's work is done—his last furrow turned, his last sward mown—and he is laid by, to retain for a little longer his feeble hold upon life, in the nook by his cottage fire! Few can look back upon their career with less of regret or bitterness. The fight, it may be, was a cruel one while it lasted; but when he can work no more—when his hard destiny is at length appeased—there is a softness and almost child-like gentleness and simplicity comes over the aged peasant who has worn away his life in daily labour. The scenes of his life-long struggle become hallowed with affections of which he was never conscious when, in the thoughtlessness of youth or in the vigour of manhood, he was toiling amongst them from morning till night. Then, when he was earning the frugal means of his own and his family's existence, with the sweat of his brow and the labour of his hands, his mind had no room for more tender feelings; but now, when his hands are powerless, and the sap of his strength dried up, associations unthought-of before rise up, and bind the well-remembered fields, the woods, the lanes, the crops, the seasons, the very animals and implements, by ties which to him are dear and sacred. The ties which bind us to the soil, and make our affections cling around some few bits of the earth's surface, are rooted as deeply in his nature. The old feudal attachment of the peasant to the soil, however much changes of time and circumstances may have weakened it, and however utterly it is ignored by the present age, has not yet lost its influence and died out. And long may it continue.

What are the corresponding duties of the soil and the lords of the soil to the labourer, it is not our purpose now to inquire. The centralizing and systematizing habit of the day, with its disregard of local customs, and its contempt for irregular, undefined associations, tends to loosen this attachment. It tends to shake the old established order of agricultural society, to spread a notion of factious and capricious independence, to make the labourer dissatisfied with his condition, and to set before him as the first duty of man to strive to rise out of it.

It is the duty of all who take an interest in the well-being of every class of the Agricultural population, to watch the operation of the various schemes set in motion for the purpose. In great social and mental reformations, all thoughtful men will endeavour to direct, not to check, the progress of opinion. The infusion of new false principles is a danger more to be guarded

against, than failure in getting rid of old ones whose day is past. In removing abuses, and cutting away long-standing obstacles to development and improvement, much that is preservative and cohesive may be torn up too. If an unsparing hand tears away the ivy which, from venerable neglect and in the slow growth of years, has been suffered to cover a wall, he will, perhaps, remove one of its main supports, and dislodge many loosening fragments which it has held together. If old ideas are uprooted, others must be planted in their place. The amelioration of our peasantry is one of the great social problems of the day, and in its solution many ecclesiastical interests are involved. The clergy as a body have an important stake in the matter. The welfare of five-sixths of the parishioners of all rural incumbents depends upon the treatment it receives. Nowhere has the Church planted herself more firmly, and wound herself more intimately into the hearts and habits and every-day life of the people, than amongst the rural poor. Nowhere are her defences more efficiently guarded and her hold more secure; and from no other quarter would she receive so severe a shock, if there should be any abrupt severance of old ties, any dispersion of old associations, any great upheaval of old-established customs and modes of thought, any radical innovations which she did not control and direct.

ART. II.—*Vetus Testamentum ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum, secundum exemplar Vaticanum Romæ editum. Accedit potior varietas codicis Alexandrini.* Oxonii: e Typographeo Academico. MDCCCXLVIII. 3 vols. 12mo.

2. *Vetus et Novum Testamentum ex antiquissimo codice Vaticano.* Edidit ANGELUS MAIUS, S.R.E. Card. Romæ: MDCCCLVII. 5 vols. 4to.

3. *Vetus Testamentum Græce juxta LXX interpretes. Recensionem Grabianam . . . recognovit, &c.* FREDERICUS FIELD, A.A.M., Coll. SS. Trin. Cantab. olim socius. Oxonii: Excudebat Jacobus Wright, Academiæ Typographus. MDCCCLIX.

4. *Vetus Testamentum Græce juxta LXX interpretes.* Ed. &c. C. TISCHENDORF. Editio tertia. Lipsiæ: F. A. Brockhaus. 1860.

AMONG the many subjects to which the attention of Biblical students has of late years been directed, the text of the Greek translation of the Old Testament, commonly known by the name of the Septuagint, is not the least important. Various editions of it have been put forth, out of which we have selected those which are named at the head of this article. Some important additions have been made to the manuscript materials of the text in the course of the present century. The works of Mr. Grinfield have been of great service in bringing the claims of Hellenistic Greek in a more accessible form before the learned world; and his liberal endowment of a lecture in the University of Oxford will, we hope, answer his expectations, in directing the attention of some at least among its members to the more definite and methodical study of the Septuagintal text.

For it must be owned, that though there has been a considerable accumulation of material for helping to approximate to a better text of the Septuagint than that of the common Sixtine edition, but little has been effectually done in this direction hitherto. Indeed, the thing has hardly been attempted. Of Mr. Field's recension of Grabe's text we shall have occasion to speak presently: meanwhile it may be useful to cite from Mr. Field's Prolegomena his remarks upon the Moscow edition of MDCCCXXI, which he, as editor in behalf of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, made the archetype of his own: 'Quod vero ad vitiosam ejus methodum attinet, ne Societas nostra, quæ sciens prudensque Editorum Mosquensium vestigiis institerit, immeritam vituperationem subeat, mitigandæ censuræ causa tenendum est, primum, ei in proposito fuisse, Sacrum Codicem non tam criticos ad usus, quam ad piorum hominum,

'tam domi quam foris, harum literarum cultorum, in fide et doctrina Christiana profectum accommodare.' Mr. Field's volume, then, does not profess to be an edition suited to the requirements of Biblical criticism: his text seems rather one made up for the accommodation of those readers who wish to have a Greek translation answering to the Hebrew original.¹ We hope to suggest, in the course of this article, another principle on which it would be sounder and safer to reconstruct the Septuagintal text, so far that is as our existing materials enable us to carry out or to attempt the plan.

But before we proceed to devote time and labour to such a work, it may be asked *cui bono?* Is the text of the Septuagint worth the trouble it will cost? Now in order to estimate the force of the claims which the Greek version of the Hebrew Scriptures has upon our attention, we will endeavour to state in a very general form a brief summary of what may be urged, on both sides, for and against the authority and value which it may be supposed to possess.

In its favour, then, may be urged—1. That the Greek version of the Old Testament, commonly known by the name of the Septuagint, was the first version ever made of the Hebrew Scriptures; that it was made before the Christian æra, and subsequently to the time when Hebrew was the vernacular tongue of the Jews in Palestine. 2. That the Greek version was generally received by the Jews who were settled in other countries, and was in common use among them. 3. That the writers of the New Testament very often make their citations from the Greek text, sometimes even where it differs from the present Hebrew text. 4. That this Greek version was generally received by the whole Christian Church during the first four centuries, or at least before the time of S. Jerome, who died Sept. 30, A.D. 420. 5. That the ancient versions of the Old Testament (with the exception of the Syriac version) were made from the Septuagint. Especially from this source came the old Italic version. 6. That both Josephus and Philo acknowledge the authority of the Greek text. In their citations from the Old Testament the former is said to rely equally on the Hebrew and on the Greek texts: and with regard to the latter, it has been computed that in about 2,300 quotations from the Old Testament Scriptures in the course of his works, he very rarely deviates from the words of the Septuagint. 7. That on comparing the Greek of the Septuagint version with that of the New Testament, the two styles are found to resemble each other very closely, not only in grammatical construction, but also in

¹ Professedly so, as regards the order of the books: '*Græca secundum ordinem textus Hebræi reformavit.*'—Title-page.

terminology, especially in such terms as Repentance, Faith, Righteousness, Justification, Sanctification, Redemption, &c. &c., and in such names or titles as Lord, Christ, Saviour, Holy Spirit, Almighty, Highest, Eternal, &c. To some of these points we may perhaps hereafter call the attention of our readers, if opportunity permit. For the present it may be enough to refer to Mr. Grinfield's apology for the Septuagint, and to Mr. Churton's admirable little treatise.¹ 8. That the Septuagint version exercised great influence in the controversies of the early Christians with Jews and Pagan Philosophers.² 9. That the Septuagint version exercised great influence on the doctrinal language of the early Church.³

These propositions will, we think, be admitted without much hesitation as generally true by all who have inquired into the subject; and we are anxious not to state, at the outset, more than will be at once admitted: taken separately, they furnish each of them a weighty argument for the importance of studying the text of the Septuagint; when they are taken conjointly, the force of the argument can hardly be over-estimated. BUT (alas! there is always a *but*) here come in considerations which must very much qualify the authority which the Septuagintal text might be supposed to vindicate.

For it will, we think, be at once allowed—1. That the Septuagintal text had departed very much from its original purity before the time of Origen, who died A.D. 253 or 254, at Tyre, just after the close of the Decian persecution, A.D. 251. 2. That Origen made a most laborious attempt to reconstruct the original text of the Septuagint; but that the gigantic attempt, though well meant, ended in a failure as gigantic, and, in fact, made matters worse. 3. That the text of the Septuagint in ordinary circulation (the Sixtine text), is found to differ in many places from the Hebrew original, sometimes by omission, sometimes by addition, sometimes by variation. Add to this circumstance another—viz., that it is by no means certain upon what Greek MSS. the Sixtine text is based: the Oxford edition bears upon its title-page, '*Secundum exemplar Vaticanum Romæ editum*;' but the text of the *exemplar Vaticanum* is by no means the text of the *Codex Vaticanus*, and a comparison of the Sixtine text with that of Cardinal Mai's edition from the celebrated Vatican MS. exhibits a wide divergence between the two, as will be presently shown.

¹ An Apology for the Septuagint. By E. W. Grinfield, M.A. London: Pickering. 1850. 1 vol. 8vo. The Influence of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament upon the Progress of Christianity. By the Rev. William Ralph Churton, B.A. Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: Macmillan and Co. 1861.

² Churton, P. I. ch. ii.

³ Churton, P. II. ch. iii.

It would seem, then, that we cannot, without further data, rely on our present text of the Septuagint, taken as a whole. If that text had become corrupted by the time of Origen, if his labours only made matters worse, if we have at present only scanty materials for ascertaining the earlier text before the time of Origen, it would certainly appear as though we are still in want of that first requisite, which every document of authority ought to possess, namely, a substantial guarantee for its genuineness. We no longer have it as the translators wrote it; at least it cannot be shown that we have.

Does it follow that the Septuagintal text is without value? By no means. There have been disturbing forces at work on its general surface; but enough remains to show us, at least, the nature of its terminology, of its phraseology, of its grammatical constructions. These forces have, no doubt, often dislocated the text, but they have not destroyed it. We cannot rely upon it (independently of other considerations) as the authoritative rendering for such and such a passage in the Hebrew text; but we can rely upon it to show what were the influences brought to bear upon the Greek language by being placed in contact with Hebrew forms of thought and diction; we can rely upon it as giving in a general way the sense of the Hebrew Scriptures: nay, we can go further, and say that the Septuagint version is in many chapters a very literal translation from the Hebrew, and that its divergences from the Hebrew can often be explained by a different vowel-pointing of the original, or by a different punctuation. Moreover, the Septuagint still remains full of words and constructions all closely related to, or rather identical with, those employed by the writers of the New Testament. Have we, or are we likely to have, the means of arriving at a purer form of text than that which we at present possess? It will be our endeavour to furnish some answer to this question in the course of this article. And first we propose to lay before our readers a brief outline of the history of the Septuagintal text, under the guidance of Professor Tischendorf, from whose *Prolegomena* prefixed to his last edition of the Septuagint (that one named at the head of this article), we have drawn the greater part of the following remarks, and to whom we here (once for all) gratefully acknowledge our obligations:—

I. THE PROBABLE DATE OF THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION.—For arriving at the probable date when this version was made, we have the following notices, which have been selected from other evidence:—

1. There is extant a letter of Aristeas addressed to his brother

Philocrates. Aristæas, it appears, was one of the body-guard to Ptolemy II., called Philadelphus, who reigned B.C. 284 (or -5) to 246 (or -7). According to this letter, Demetrius Phalereus, the Royal librarian of his day at Alexandria, suggested to the king, that the laws of the Jews (*τῶν Ἰουδαίων νόμιμα*) should be translated into Greek. In consequence of the librarian's suggestion, which appears to have been graciously received by the king's majesty, a letter was addressed to the high priest Eleazar, who eventually sent down to Egypt seventy-two persons, six from each tribe. According to the letter (or legend), these seventy-two translators were themselves translated to the island of Pharos, where they finished their translation of the Pentateuch in seventy-two days.¹

2. According to Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius, Aristobolus, a Jewish philosopher, a cotemporary of Ptolemy VI., called Philometer (his reign lasted from B.C. 181 to 146, but he was a mere child at his accession), mentions the translation of the law as having been made in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus.²

3. Two centuries later, Philo Judæus, born about A.D. 1,³ says that the translators, on their arrival, were examined by the king as to their capability and readiness; that they were sent over to Pharos in order to be in perfect seclusion; that there, remote from men, and in the presence of nature only, they offered up their prayers, and in answer to their prayers they were enabled to give the identically same renderings in Greek for the Hebrew original.⁴ So wonderful was this result, that (says Philo) the Greeks who know Chaldee, and the Chaldees who know Greek, pay the same veneration to the translation as to the original, considering the authors of the translation rather as persons inspired than as translators.⁵ A festival was yearly held at Pharos to commemorate the making of the translation, and it was attended not only by Jews, but by crowds of other people besides (*παμπληθεῖς ἕτεροι*).

4. Josephus, born A.D. 37, takes his account of the making of the Greek translation from the letter of Aristæas, whom he calls Ἀρισταῖος.⁶

¹ See Hody de Bibl. text. origin. Oxford, 1705. Fol. pp. i—xxxvi. The letter of Ptolemy to Eleazar is at p. vi.; of Eleazar to Ptolemy at p. vii.

² Clem. Al. Strom. i. p. 410. Eusebius, Præp. Ev. ix. 6, xiii. 12. The words of Aristobolus, quoted by Eusebius, are ἡ δὲ δὴ ἐρμηνεία τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντων ἐπὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Φιλαδέλφου βασιλέως.

³ A. D. 20. Smith's Dict.

⁴ καθάπερ ἐνθουσιῶντες προεφήτευσον, οὐκ ἄλλα ἄλλοι, τὰ δ' αὐτὰ πάντες ὀνόματα καὶ ῥήματα, ὥστε ὑποβολέως ἐκδοτοῖς ἀοράτως ἐνηχοῦντος. De Vit. Mosi, Lib. II. (Tom. ii. pp. 139, 140, Ed. Mangey.)

⁵ καθάπερ ἀδελφάς, μᾶλλον δ' ὥς μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐν τε τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασι τεθήκασιν καὶ προσκυνοῦσιν, οὐχ, ἐρμηνεῖς ἐκείνου, ἀλλ' ἱεροφάντας καὶ προφήτας προσαγορευέντες. Ibid.

⁶ Ant. xii. II. 1—15.

5. Justin Martyr, who died between A.D. 165 and 171, says that the number of the translators was seventy; that they were shut up in seventy distinct cells, of which he had himself seen the ruins in Pharos; that they were strictly prohibited from all intercourse with each other; and that (working separately) they produced exactly the same translation—to the great astonishment of the king. But, according to Justin, the translation embraced the writings not only of Moses, but of the other prophets. And he appeals to Philo and Josephus in confirmation of his statements.¹

6. Passing over the testimony of Irenæus, and many more who might be cited, we come to Epiphanius, who died A.D. 402. According to him there were seventy-two translators, but they were to translate in couples, one couple taking Genesis, and so on. Thirty-six cells were provided, one for each couple: they worked from early dawn to evening, when they were rowed in thirty-six boats to dine (or sup) with King Ptolemy. Two servants were allowed to each couple, and their cells were lighted from above. Thus the twenty-seven books of the Old Testament (reducible by a different arrangement to twenty-two, the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet) were completed.²

7. The testimony of S. Jerome may be given in his own words, from his preface to Genesis. “Nescio quis primus auctor LXX cellulas Alexandriæ mendacio suo exstruxerit, quibus divisi eadem scriptitarint quum Aristeas ejusdem Ptolemæi ὑπερασπιστῆς et multo post tempore Josephus nihil tale retulerint, sed in una basilica congregatos contulisse scribant, non prophetasse. Aliud est enim vatem, aliud interpretem esse: ibi spiritus ventura prædicat, hic eruditio et verborum copia ea quæ intellegit transfert.” Again, S. Jerome is against the opinion of those who assert that the whole of the Old Testament was translated by the Seventy. “Quamquam et Aristeas et Josephus et omnis schola Judæorum quinque tantum libros Moysis a LXX translatos asserant.” (Comm. in Ezech. V.)

8. Two testimonies may be added from Hebrew sources. In the Babylonian Talmud mention is made (Megill. 9) of the seventy-two elders, who were shut up in as many cells by order of King Ptolemy, of their translating the Pentateuch, and of their exact agreement in the translation: in fifteen places they are said to have departed from the sacred text. In the Jeru-

¹ Cohort. ad Græcos, 13, which begins εἰ δὲ τις φάσκει καὶ τὴν Μασίως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προφητῶν τοῖς Ἑλλήνων γεγράφθαι γράμμασι κ. τ. λ. So in Apol. I. 31, he mentions τὰς βίβλους τῶν προφητιῶν, but unfortunately makes Ptolemy send τῷ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τότε βασιλεύοντι Ἡρώδῃ. (!)

² De Mens. et Pond. III. A—C, p. 161.

saalem Talmud mention is made (Megill. 6) of the translation, but nothing is said of King Ptolemy, nothing about the number of the translators, or of the cells, nor is it stated that the translation was confined to the Pentateuch. But in the thirteen places in which, according to this authority, the translators are said to have departed from the Hebrew text, it is to be noted that the citations are all of them made from the Pentateuch.¹

In the endeavour to come to a probable conclusion from the above scattered notices, it may be observed that the letter of Aristæas (on which so much depends), though it was received with unquestioning faith for more than fifteen centuries (as for instance by S. Jerome himself), is now generally admitted to be not genuine. Its genuineness was first called in question by Ludovicus de Vivis,² and its spuriousness seems to be fairly established by Humfry Hody, formerly Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford;³ and the general, though not the universal, consent seems to have relegated to the province of legend the number of the translators, their being shut up in cells, and their inspiration in the work of translation.⁴

The letter, however, of Aristæas, if it do not state what is true, may perhaps point to what is true. There are, for instance, some grounds for thinking that the tradition is right in assigning the commencement of the translation, i.e. the translation of the Pentateuch, to the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. There is on this point a very general consent among ancient writers, and it is likely that whenever the work of translating the Holy Scriptures was taken in hand the Pentateuch would have the very first place.

The long captivity of the Jews, who were brought down into Egypt by Ptolemy I., surnamed Soter, the reputed son of

¹ The Mishna or text of the oral law (which was considered as the interpretation of the written law) is supposed to have been reduced to writing A.D. 190 or 220. The Gemara (or commentary) in the Babylonian Talmud was begun A.D. 427 and completed A.D. 500. The date of the Gemara in the Jerusalem Talmud is variously put at 230, 270, 370, A.D. but was certainly prior to the Babylonian Talmud. The Amsterdam edition of the latter (1763) occupies eighteen volumes folio (!), the Mishna (Amst. 1698) six volumes folio.

² In his commentary on Aug. de Civ. xviii. 42. (Basle, 1522.)

³ First in a treatise against the story of Aristæas (Oxford, 1685), afterwards more fully in a work on the original texts of the Bible (Oxford, 1705), a work which still remains the great repertory for Septuagintal lore. The Oxford edition of the LXX. (1848) was, we believe, prepared by the late learned Regius Professor of Greek, Dr. Gaisford.

⁴ For the genuineness of the letter of Aristæas, Mr. Grinfield refers to the 'Vindication' (London, 1736), the 'Apologia Sententiæ Patrum,' appended to the LXX. edition of Daniel (Rome, 1772), Gregory's History of the LXX. (London, 1664). See 'Apol. for the Septuagint,' Appendix, No. 4, p. 148. Professor Tischendorf refers to a learned work, in four volumes, by Constantine Oiconomos (Athens, 1854).

Lagus (Ptolemy died B.C. 283), might render them desirous of having a Greek version of their Scriptures; and the well-known fondness of the Ptolemies for Greek literature would render them favourably disposed to such a desire, and might lead them to concur in giving it effect.

Again, in the prologue to the Wisdom of Jesus, son of Sirach, the translator (who was grandson to the author of that book) states that he (the translator) was in Egypt in the thirty-eighth year in the time of King Euergetes; and he seems to imply that there was existing at that time a Greek translation of all the Old Testament.¹ Now there were two Ptolemies who bore the surname of Euergetes. Ptolemy (III.) Euergetes I. reigned B.C. 247—222, or twenty-five years. Ptolemy (VII.) Euergetes II. (called also Φύσκων) assumed the regal title B.C. 170, and died 117.² If the thirty-eighth year named in the prologue is to be reckoned from the accession of the Euergetes there mentioned, then that Euergetes must be Euergetes II., and the date when the translator of the Wisdom of Siracides was in Egypt must have been B.C. 132.³ At this time, then, it would seem that the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures had been translated into Greek. But if the thirty-eighth year refer to some other starting point of time, and if *also* the first Euergetes be the one intended in the prologue, then the translation of the Old Testament into Greek must have been completed at an earlier date, say B.C. 220.

Again, from the last sentence in the Book of Esther (LXX.), it would appear that the translation of that book must have been made in or before the fourth year of Ptolemy and Cleopatra.⁴

¹ Οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος, καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων οὐ μικρὰν ἔχει τὴν διαφορὰν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λεγόμενα. Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου βασιλείας παραγενηθεὶς εἰς Αἴγυπτον, κ.τ.λ. The ταῦτα refers to the writings of the grandfather, translated by the grandson: ἐν ἑαυτοῖς is explained by Ἐβραϊστί in the sentence before; and the translator is pointing out the difference between the original and the translation. The question is, What translation? His own translation of his grandfather's work into Greek would seem to indicate that he was speaking of a Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. His mention of Egypt points to the same conclusion. Greek would be the language current among the Jews settled in that country.

² Thus 'according to this mode of computation, his death took place in the fifty-fourth year of his reign.' Smith's Dict.

³ Such an interpretation of ἐπὶ is justified by 1 Mc. xiii. 42, xiv. 27; Hagg. i. 1, ii. 1; Zach. i. 7, vii. 1. Polybius visited Egypt about the same time.

⁴ Esth. x. 3 (p. 1092, Oxford edit. 1843). Ἐτους τετάρτου βασιλεύοντος Πτολεμαίου καὶ Κλεοπάτρας, εἰσήνεγκε Δοσίθεος, ὃς ἔφη εἶναι ἱερεὺς καὶ Λευίτης, καὶ Πτολεμαῖος ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, τὴν προκειμένην ἐπιστολὴν τῶν Φρουρῶν, ἣν ἔφασαν εἶναι καὶ πρηνευκέναι Λυσίμαχον Πτολεμαίου, τὸν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ. Schleusener renders εἰσήνεγκε, in lucem protulit ac publicavit. Fritzsche renders, Brachte herein, herbei, näm. nach Aegypten: ἐπιστολὴν probably refers to the writing of Mordecai, Esth. ix. 26 (LXX.), so virtually implies the whole book. Esth. ix. 20. It would seem, then, that the translation of such a document into Greek had become a matter of necessity.

But then there were four Ptolemies from V. to VIII.—viz., Epiphanes, Philometor, Physkon, and Lathuros, who each married a Cleopatra. The more general opinion, however, inclines to Philometor; and the Cleopatra intended is perhaps his mother, who was regent for him during his minority. If so, then the fourth year is to be reckoned from B.C. 181, when the father of Philometor died, and brings us down to B.C. 177, as the date for the translation of Esther: and as this would probably be among the last of the translated books (if not the last), there seems to be some ground for inferring that the whole of the Old Testament had been translated into Greek before the middle of the second century B.C. But the historical value of the additions to the Book of Esther is a matter of question.

The story of the seventy-two cells, and the tradition of Divine inspiration granted to the translators, cannot be shown to rest on any historical basis, and they have quite the look of a legendary addition; but they may point to a conviction generally established, that the translation was, upon the whole, faithfully done, and that it was received as an adequate representation of the original text among those who were unacquainted with Hebrew, or who at all events were better acquainted with Greek than they were with Hebrew.

II. THE TRANSLATORS.—It is quite uncertain who these were. It seems pretty clear that the books were translated at various times, and by various hands. Some books are better rendered than others. The translation of the Pentateuch, for example, is better than that of the Prophets. There are, however, fair arguments for supposing that the translators were, for the most part, Alexandrine Jews.¹

It is altogether uncertain from what source or sources the variations from the Masoretic text, which the Septuagint exhibits, are derived. The unpointed state of the Hebrew text, at the time when the version was made, will undoubtedly account for many. Some critics have maintained that the Greek version was made, not from the Hebrew text, but from a Chaldee paraphrase; others have supposed the Pentateuch to have been rendered from the Samaritan text.

We have before mentioned how far Philo and Josephus use and recognise the Septuagint version: it may be added that from this earliest version were derived the Armenian, Coptic,

¹ See Hody, Eichhorn, Frankel. On the differences in translation between the Pentateuch and Joshua, see Egli 'Zur Kritik der Septuaginta,' in the *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1862, xiv. pp. 287, et seq.

Arabic, Iberian, Slavic, Old Latin (or Italic) versions of the Old Testament. 'There was only one exception to this general adherence to the Septuagint, and that was in the Churches of Mesopotamia and the neighbouring regions, where Syriac was commonly spoken. Here they had a Syriac translation made from the Hebrew, certainly not long after the age of the Apostles, and perhaps more ancient. These Syrians or Chaldeans had two versions, one from the Hebrew, and the other from the Septuagint.' (Churton, p. 77.)

III. THE CURRENT TEXT OF THE SEPTUAGINT.—This may be said to be the text of the edition put forth at Rome by the authority of Pope Sixtus V., A.D. MDLXXXVI. Previously to that edition had appeared the celebrated Complutensian Polyglott Bible, in six folio volumes. It was printed between the years 1514—1517, but was not published till 1522. In the meanwhile had appeared the Venetian or Aldine edition (1518), in three volumes, containing the Old and New Testaments. The texts of both these editions were derived from later MSS., and are decidedly inferior to the text of the Roman edition, but of the two the Aldine text is considered the best.¹ The Sixtine text, which is the one adopted in the Oxford edition, professes to be formed mainly on the celebrated Vatican MS. at Rome. The following are the words of the illustrious Cardinal Antonius Carafa, Librarian of the Holy Apostolical See, in his dedication of the Roman edition to Pope Sixtus V. :—'Intelleximus cum ex ipsa collatione, tum è sacrorum veterum Scriptorum consensione, Vaticanum codicem non solum vetustate, verum etiam bonitate cæteris anteire; quodque caput est, ad ipsam, quam quærebamus, Septuaginta interpretationem, si non toto libro, majori certè ex parte, quam proximè accedere. Quod mihi cum multis aliis argumentis constaret, vel ipso etiam libri titulo, qui est *κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα*, curavi de consilio et sententia eorum, quos supra nominavi, hujus libri editionem ad Vaticanum exemplar emendandam; vel potius exemplar ipsum, quodd ejus valde probaretur auctoritas, de verbo ad verbum repræsentandum acuratè prius, sicubi opus fuit, recognitum, et notationibus etiam auctum.' Yet when we come to compare the Vatican text of Cardinal Carafa, in 1586, with the Vatican text of his illustrious successor Cardinal Mai, in 1857, we find a very considerable discrepancy between the two, as will be seen from the collation of the first six chapters in the Book of Joshua

¹ Subsequent editions of the Complutensian text were published at Antwerp, 1572; Hamburg, 1596; Paris, 1645. The Aldine text was republished at Strassburg, 1526; Baale, 1545; Frankfort, 1597; and again at Venice, 1687.

subjoined in the note below.¹ The letter A denotes when the Alexandrine text (taken from Baber) agrees with the Maian. The bracketed readings show where the Alexandrine differs from both.

1	SIXTINE TEXT.	MAIAN TEXT.
Insc.	ιησους ναυη	ιησους υιος ναυη A.
1, 1.	ειπε. 2. τετελευτηκε	ειπεν A. τετελευτηκεν A.
1, 5.	ουδ	ουδε A.
1, 6.	αποδιελεις	1. m. διελεις 2. m. αποδιελεις [αποδι-αστελεις A.]
1, 8.	ευοδωσεις	ευοδωσει
1, 15.	κληρονομησουσι	κληρονομησουσιν A.
1, 16.	οσα εαν	οσα αν
1, 18.	ος αν	ος εαν
— —	καθоти εαν	καθоти αν
— —	εντειλη αυτω	αυτω εντειλη
2, 1.	σαττιν	σαττειν [σαττει A.]
— —	οι δυο νεανισκοι εισηλθουσιν	εισηλθουσιν οι δυο νεανισκοι
2, 3.	ειπε, ηκασι	ειπεν A. ηκασιν A.
2, 4.	εισεληλυθασι	εισεληλυθασιν A.
2, 5.	καταληψεσθε	καταλημψεσθε A.
2, 8.	προς αυτους επι το δωμα	επι το δωμα προς αυτους
2, 9.	ειπε	ειπεν A.
— —	εδωκεν	δεδωκεν
— —	κυριος	κυριος 2. m. ο κ.
— —	επιπετωκε	επιπετωκεν A.
2, 10.	κατεξηρανε	κατεξηραναν A.
— —	εποιησε βασιλευσι [— σι A.]	εποιησεν A. βασιλευσιν
— —	εξωλεθρευσατε	εξωλεθρευσατε [εξωλεθρευσατε A.]
2, 11.	θεος εν ουρανω	ος εν ουρανω
2, 14.	παραδω	παραδοι
2, 17.	προς αυτην οι ανδρες	οι ανδρες προς αυτην
2, 24.	παρεδεδωκε	παρεδωκεν A.
— —	κατεπηχε	κατεπηχεν A.
3, 4.	αμιεσον υμων	ανα μεσον ημων
3, 5.	κυριος εν υμιν	εν ημιν κυριος
3, 7.	ειπε	ειπεν A.
3, 8.	ιερευσι αιρουσι	ιερευσιν αιρουσιν A.
— —	επι μερους	επι μεσου. (See Corrigenda.)
3, 10.	ολοθρευων ολοθρευσει	ολεθρευων ολεθρευσει A.
3, 14.	διαθηκης κυριου	οm. κυριου
3, 15.	επληρουτο	επληρου A.
3, 16.	καριαβιαριμ	Cod. καθιαιρειν
— —	εξελιπε	εξελιπεν [εξελειπεν A.]
— —	ιεριχω	ιεριχω
3, 17.	συντελεσε	συντελεσεν
4, 1.	συντελεσε	συντελεσεν [συντελεσεν A.]
— —	ειπε	ειπεν A.
4, 3.	στρατοπεδεια	στρατοπεδια [στρατοπαδια A.]
4, 8.	αναλαβοντες	λαβοντες A.
— —	συνεταξε	συνεταξεν A.
4, 9.	εστησε	εστησεν [εστηκεν A.]
4, 11.	συντελεσε	συντελεσεν A.
4, 13.	ιεριχω	ιεριχω
4, 14.	ηξησε	ηξησεν A.
4, 15.	ειπε	ειπεν A.
4, 16.	ιερευσι	ιερευσιν A.
— —	αιρουσι	αιρουσιν A.
4, 17.	ιερευσι	ιερευσιν A.
4, 18.	ωρμησε	ωρμησεν A.

From the instances quoted in the note below, it is at once evident that the Sixtine text does by no means represent with

SIXTINE TEXT.

- 4, 18. *χθες*
 4, 19. *ιεριχω*
 4, 23. *εποιησε*
 — — *απεξηρανε*
 4, 24. *γνωσι. εστι*
 5, 1. *απεξηρανε*
 5, 2. *ειπε*
 5, 2, 3. *περιετεμε*
 — — *εκ δευτερου*
 5, 5. *τεσσαρακοντα*
 — — *μαββαριτιδι*
 5, 6. *διο*
 — — *διωρισε*
 — — *ωμοσε*
 5, 7. *αντικατεστησε*
 — — *περιετεμε*
 5, 8. *ειπε*
 — — *εκαλεσε*
 5, 9. *αφ*
 — — *ιεριχω*
 5, 11. *εξελειπε*
 — — *υπηρχε*
 — — *χωραν*
 5, 12. *ιεριχω*
 5, 15. *επ αυτου*
 — — *εστι*
 6, 1. *συγκεκλεισμενη*
 — — *ουδεις*
 6, 1, 2. *ιεριχω*
 6, 2. *ειπε*
 — — *υποχειριον σοι την ιεριχω [σου*
 φορ σοι Α.]
 6, 8. *παραπορευεσθωσαν εμπροσθεν*
 6, 9. *μηδεις*
 — — *υμων*
 — — *διαγγειλη αυτος*
 6, 13. *περικυκλωσε*
 — — *εξακis*
 — — *απηλθε*
 6, 14. *εν τη ημερα εκεινη*
 — — *επτακis*
 6, 15. *εγενετο*
 — — *ιησους*
 — — *παρεδωκε*
 6, 16. *παντα 2^ο*
 6, 17. *φυλαξεσθε*
 6, 19. *ηλαλαξε*
 6, 21. *δυσι*
 6, 22. *αυτη*
 6, 23. *πασι*
 6, 24. *αυτης τον πατρικον*
 — — *κατωκισεν*
 — — *εκρυψε*
 — — *ιεριχω*
 6, 25. *αβιρων*
 — — *επεστησε*

MAIAN TEXT.

- εχθες Α.*
ιεριχω
εποιησεν [εποιησαν Α.]
απεξηραναν Α.
γνωσιν Α. εστιν Α.
απεξηραναν Α.
ειπεν Α.
περιετεμεν Α.
οm.
τεσσαρακοντα Α.
μαββαριτιδι text and 2m. μαδκ. 1 m.
διο οι
διωρισεν Α.
ωμοσεν Α.
αντικατεστησεν Α.
περιετεμεν Α.
ειπεν Α.
εκαλεσεν Α.
απο
ιεριχω
εξελειπεν [εξελεipεν Α.]
υπηρχεν Α.
κουραν
ιεριχω
οm.
εστιν Α.
συγκεκλεισμενη [συγκεκλισμενη Α.]
ουθεις
ιεριχω
ειπεν Α.
την ιεριχω υποχειριαν
εμπροσθεν παραπορευεσθωσαν
μηθεις Α.
οm.
αυτος διαγγειλη
— σεν
οm.
απηλθεν
οm. Α.
εξακis
οm. Α.
ο ιησους
παρεδωκεν [παρεδεδωκεν Α.]
οm.
φυλαξασθε [φυλαξατε Α.]
ηλαλαξεν Α.
δυσιν [δυο Α.]
αυτης
πασιν Α.
τον πατρικον αυτης Α.
κατωκισεν Α.
εκρυψεν Α.
ιεριχω Α.
αβειρων Α.
επεστησεν Α.

accuracy the text of the Vatican MS. Nor does it appear at all clearly on what precise authority the variations of the Sixtine text from the Vatican MS. (its professed basis) rest. In the preface to the Sixtine edition (attributed to Petrus Morinus), it is stated that besides the Vatican MS. two others have been employed; one, the Codex Venetus, from the library of Cardinal Bessarion; the other, a MS. belonging to Cardinal Carafa. The Codex Venetus contains the Book of Job from ch. xxx., Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song, Wisdom, Siracides, all the Prophets, Tobit, Judith, three Books of Maccabees. It is written in uncial characters, and its date is thought to be of the eighth or ninth century. The MS. which belonged to Cardinal Carafa agrees closely with the text of the Vatican, and from it might possibly have been supplemented those parts of Genesis and the Psalms which are wanting in the Vatican MS. Bessarion's MS. might have been used for supplementing the Books of the Maccabees, which the Vatican MS. has not. Other books, it is further stated in the preface, from the Medicean library at Florence were used. But the Vatican MS. was the main authority. How far the assertion in the preface to the Sixtine edition is true, that the edition does not differ a hair's breadth from the MS. ('cum . . . ne latum quidem unguem, ut aiunt, ab hujus libri auctoritate discessum sit'), our readers will be able to judge for themselves by referring to our collation. (Note, pp. 299, 300.)

But whether matters are at present ripe for framing a new recension of the Septuagintal text is a very grave question indeed. From this great labour even the indefatigable and not timorous Professor Tischendorf has hitherto shrunk; nor does he in his recently published editions of the Septuagint do more than exhibit the text of the Sixtine edition, with some few alterations, and the additions of various readings from the Alexandrine, Frederico-Augustan, and Ephraem Rescript MSS.¹

IV. MATERIALS FOR A FUTURE RECENSION OF THE SEPTUAGINTAL TEXT.—The number of MSS. containing either the whole or a part of the New Testament in Greek amounts to about one thousand. The MSS. of the Septuagint (at present known) do not amount to much more than four hundred. They

¹ The variations of the Tischendorffian from the Sixtine text may be classified under the heads of—Punctuation, Greater use of capital initial letters. Numbering of verses, Notation where chapters are differently arranged (as in Jeremiah, Siracides), Accents, Division of such words as ἀναμέσον, διαπαντός, &c. Breathings (including aspirate consonants), subscript. *ν ἐφελευστικόν*. A list of the corrections, *majoris momenti*, is given in Prof. Tischendorf's Prolegomena, xvi. pp. xxxiv—xliii. Then follows a list of emendations from other MSS. principally the Alexandrine. Prol. xvii. pp. xliii—xlvii.

are dispersed in different localities throughout Europe and the East, but the principal depositaries are Rome, Paris, Florence, Vienna, London, Oxford, and Venice. Rather more than three hundred are cited in Holmes' edition of the Septuagint, and about one hundred more have since been added. Of these four hundred MSS., the greater part are in cursive characters, and date from the tenth century downwards. Fifteen in uncial characters are mentioned by Holmes, dating from the fourth to the ninth or tenth century. There are, however, very few MSS. indeed which contain the whole of the Old Testament in Greek. They do not amount to ten. More than eighty contain the Pentateuch, either the whole or in part. The Psalms appear in the greatest number of MSS., about one hundred and fifty in all. Isaiah and Daniel appear in about forty MSS.; Job in about thirty; Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song, Baruch, in about twenty; a smaller number contain Tobit, Judith, Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Siracides, the Books of the Maccabees.

Of the uncial MSS. mentioned by Holmes, the two oldest and most famous are the Alexandrine and the Vatican MSS. As we have in a previous number¹ given some account of these documents in connexion with their bearing on the text of the New Testament, we may be permitted to refer to what was there said for a general description of their age and character. It will be enough on the present occasion if we say a few words about each in connexion with the text of the Septuagint.

Of all known extant MSS. the Alexandrine gives most completely the text of the Septuagint, for it contains the whole.² Various readings gathered from it by Alexander Huissius were inserted by Walton in his celebrated Polyglott Bible (London, 1657—1660). The text itself was published by Ernest Grabe and two others, in four volumes, folio (Oxford, 1707—1720).³ In this edition Grabe professes to have given the readings of the Alexandrine MS. either in the text or at the margin, except what appear to be manifest blunders of the scribe, or may be put down to variations in orthography, &c. The editor has also used certain marks and variations in the Greek type to denote the supposed additions made to the original text by Theodotion and others, and the passages which occur

¹ See *Christian Remembrancer*, No. cxii. p. 367.

² Except from 1 Kings (=1 Sam.) xii. 17, βασις ἐφ' εαυτοῖς. Here one leaf (168) has been lost. Also from Ps. xlix. (l.) 19, δολιοτητα, to Ps. lxxix. (lxxx.) 11, where the MS. recommences with the words τὰς κειρὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. Here several leaves have been lost. A few verses and words have also perished elsewhere.

³ Vol. I. by Grabe, 1707, Octateuch. Vol. IV. by Grabe, 1709, Psalms, &c. Vol. II. by Lee, 1719, Historical Books. Vol. III. by Wigan, 1720, Prophetical Books.

in the Greek but are not found in the Hebrew text.¹ The defects with which the edition is charged are, that the variations made by different hands are not in all cases given in full; that where a correction has been made in the text by the editor, he has omitted to specify the actual reading of the MS.² There are besides errors of collation.³

Between the years 1812-1826 the text of the Septuagint from the Alexandrine MS. was published in fac-simile under the editorship of H. H. Baber. As a specimen of typography the work is a noble production, occupying with notes and prolegomena three very large folio volumes. Its defects are, that it contains many misprints, some of which are corrected in the appendix, others are not so.⁴ Again, the readings in the text and the notes do not always agree, so that the reader is left in doubt which is the true reading of the MS.⁵ It is further said that erased words or letters require a more thorough examination. Again, there is certainly some confusion in the mode of describing the different correctors. Sometimes the correction is made 'manu antiqua,' then 'manu perantiqua:' then we have 'corrector quidam vetustissimus,' then 'corrector vetustus.' We may remark that there is a somewhat similar looseness in describing the different correctors of the Codex Bezae, in the notes to Kipling's splendid fac-simile edition of that MS. Kipling, however, gives in his preface what he conceives to be the chronological order of these various hands.

But, in spite of these blemishes, it must be allowed that Mr. Baber's fac-simile edition of the Septuagint, according to the Alexandrine MS., is a noble production. He says himself, 'Labores plane Herculeos in libros Veteris Testamenti typis Codicis Alexandrini palæographiæ assimilibus describendo se exantlasse;' 'plagulas enim terque, quaterque, aliquando etiam sexies cum autographo se contulisse.' Any one at all conversant with this kind of work will be aware what unremitting vigilance and genuine hard labour are required to ensure any-

¹ The mark * denotes additions made to the text by Theodotion, &c. x denotes additions made by Origen. These additions agree with the Hebrew. The marks \ (Obeli), \ (Lemnisci), \ (Hypolemnisci), are used for passages which are not found in the Hebrew.

² E. g. Gen. xxiv. 21. The MS. has εὐδοκεν, while Grabe edits εὐδοκεν. The variation may be due either to the interchange of long and short vowels, or to the suppression of augment.

³ E. g. Ex. iv. 13. The MS. has δυναμενον αλλον, while Grabe edits αλλον δυναμενον.

⁴ More than thirty are noted in Genesis. Among misprints not noted are Gen. xlvii. 10, λωδ for αωδ. Gen. xlvii. 16, αρηθεις for αρηλεις.

⁵ Thus in Gen. i. 8, the text gives συγγενειαν; the Appendix, συγγενειαν. iii. Mac. vii. 17, the text gives ροδοφορον, the Appendix, 'ροδοφορον. Sic legit Cod. MS.' It may be added, that there is a large number of discrepancies between Woide's fac-simile text of the Alexandrine MS. of the New Testament, and his citations in the notes: the notes have, moreover, very many misprints.

thing like accuracy in all particulars. 'Quod quale sit plane scio, qui toties desudaverim in eodem laborum genere; et grato agnosco animo quam bene ille de criticis his studuis promeruit.' This is no small praise, when we consider that it comes from *Aristarchus* Tischendorf. We must remember, too, that a great advance has been made in palæographical knowledge between the years 1820 and 1860; and it is quite clear that such a production as Mr. Baber's fac-simile edition could not have been carried through at all without a genuine devotion to the work.

Prefixed to the text of the Codex Alexandrinus is a catalogue of the books in the Old and New Testaments. We give in a note a list of the former, referring our readers for a list of the latter to a former number of this Review.¹

The Codex Vaticanus belongs, most probably, to the middle of the fourth century, and is (if we except the Codex Friderico-Augustanus and its recently discovered continuation, the Codex Sinaiticus) the oldest, though not the most complete, extant witness to the text of the Septuagint. In Genesis the leaves of the MS. have been lost as far as xlvii. 28, where it commences with the words *πολιν εις γην ραμεσση*. The Psalms are also wanting from ev. 27, the MS. breaking off at the words *εν τη ερημω*, verse 26, to cxxxvii. 1, where it recommences with the words *προσκυνησω προς ναον αγιον σου*. The Books of the Maccabees appear never to have been in the MS., as Daniel is immediately followed by St. Matthew.² The text of Daniel in the MS. is that of Theodotion: Cardinal Mai has given in addition the text of the LXX. ex Codice Chisiano.³

¹ See *Christian Remembrancer*, April, 1861. * * * εστις κοσμου. ε*οδος αιγυπτου. λευιτικον. *ριθμοι δευτερονομ*ον. ιησους ναυη. κριται. ρουθ. ομου βιβλια. η. (These form the Octateuch.) βασιλιων α βασιλιων β βσιλιων γ βασιλιων δ παραλιπομενων α παραλιπομενων β ομου βιβλια τ προφηται ιτ ωσηε α αμωσ β μιχαϊας γ ιωηλ δ *β* * * * * ε ιω* * * * * τ να—ζ αμβακουμ η *φοβιας θ αγγαιος ι ζαχαριαι ια μαλαχιας ιβ ησαιας ιγ ιηρεμιας ιδ ιζεκιηλ ιε δαβηλ ιτ εσθηρ τω* ιτ *ου. ειθ εσζ* ας α ιερους εσζ* * * * * β ιερους μα* * * * * αβθων λογος α μακκαβαιων λογος β μακκαβαιων λ* * * * * γ μακκαβαιων λ* * * * * δ ψαλτηριον *ετ ωδων ιωβ παροιμιαι εκκλησιαστικη ασματα ασματων σοφια η παναρετος σοφια ιησο* νιον σιραχ.

In the text Jeremiah is followed by βαρουχ θρηνοι επιστολη ιερειμων, all expressly named: and the Second Book of Esdras is followed continuously by Nehemiah, with a heading in red ink, λογοι νεεμια υιου αχαλια.

Prefixed to the Psalms are, 1. αθανασιου αρχιεπισκοπου αλεξανδρειας εις τους ψαλμους; 2. υποθερεϊς ευσεβειου του παμφυλου; 3. περιοχαι εις τους ψαλμους; 4. κανονες ημερινοι ψαλμων; 5. κανονες νυκτερινοι ψαλμων. Affixed to the Psalms are twelve hymns from the Old and New Testaments, together with the Prayer of Manasses, and the υμνος εωθινος. ωδαι ιδ. The list is given in the Oxford edition, p. 1259.

² 'Sequitur in codice pagina pura, cujus membrana physico nexu sequenti pagine adheret in qua incipit Matthæi evangelium. Ergo nihil interjectum fuit; adeoque constare videtur, libros Machabeorum in Codice Vaticano nunquam scriptos fuisse.' Note, vol. iv. p. 372, ed. Mai.

³ There are other omissions, as in Ex. xxvi. 12, 21, xxviii. 11, xxxvi. 27,

Holmes in his edition (to be noticed hereafter) had given a collation, made from the Codex Vaticanus itself; but the collation did not include the Prophets, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song, Wisdom, Siracides. The most recent authority as to the text of the Septuagint, according to the MS., is the edition published at Rome, in 1857, in five handsomely printed quarto volumes—the first four containing the Old Testament, the fifth containing the New Testament. As early as the year 1828, Cardinal Mai (who has by his unwearied labours laid the learned world under very great obligations) had determined to exhibit the Codex Vaticanus in print. Unhappily, the execution of this work (so nobly conceived) does not correspond either to the beauty of the type, or to the known zeal and learning of the illustrious editor, who died before the actual publication of the edition which bears his name. This assertion we are in the position to *prove*, so far as regards the fifth volume, that one which contains the New Testament; for since the publication of the Cardinal's five volumes in quarto, there has been published at Rome a second edition of the New Testament according to the text of the Vatican MS.¹ Now, we have collated these two editions of the New Testament throughout, and it is hardly too much to say, that there is scarce a page in the second edition which does not contain some unexplained variation from the first edition. Of course it will be presumed that the second edition contains the right reading. No such thing. Sometimes the first edition is right, sometimes the second. This has been ascertained by actual inspection (since made) of the Codex itself.² Nor is even this all. It turns out that in some instances the two Roman editions are wrong together, and for the true reading of the MS. we must go back to the collations of Mico (usually cited as Bentley's collation), and of Birch. We are not sure whether here and there the very imperfect collation of Bartolucci (it was, we believe, the first one made) does not give the actual reading.

Now we have no means of testing the correctness of the Maian text of the Old Testament in a similar way; but we must confess, that the result of a tolerably minute comparison of

xxxviii. 5; Deut. xii. 27, xiv. 25, xxii. 3; 4 Kings xxv. 10. These passages though absent from the MS. are given in the Sixtine Text. Other passages absent both from the MS. and the Sixtine Text are 1 Kings xvii. 12–31, xvii. 55–xviii. 5; 1 Chr. i. 11–16, 18–23; Neh. xi. 16, 20, 21, 28, 29, 32–35, xii. 4–6, ix. 38, 40, 41; Prov. i. 16. Our collation of the first six chapters of Joshua shows how far the editio Vaticana (1586) differs from the Codex Vaticanus. See the same subject illustrated by Prof. Tischendorf, Prol. xciii. xciv., where is given a collation from Gen. xli. 29 to the end of that book.

¹ Novum Testamentum ex vetustissimo codice Vaticano secundis curis editum Studio Angeli Maii, S.R.E. Card. Rome, M.DCCC.LIX. Spithöver.

² The Rev. J. W. Burgon, Fellow of Oriel College; the Very Rev. the Dean of Canterbury; and the Rev. E. C. Cure, Fellow of Merton College, have each inspected the MS. and most kindly furnished us with the results.

the text of the New Testament, as given in the two recently published Roman editions, makes us very suspicious about the correctness of the Septuagintal text as exhibited in the Maian edition.¹ Indeed, the very way in which the work was set about seems extremely likely to produce an abundant crop of serious errors. The printer was told to print sheets from the Sixtine text; these were then compared with the MS., and corrected from it. It is, therefore, not wonderful that the illustrious Cardinal, when he came to revise the sheets printed off from these corrections, found a large number of *σφάλματα*. Of these, some were corrected by hand in the text itself, 'adhibitis χειροτύποις;' others were eliminated by cancelling and re-printing the page; and there are, besides, other corrigenda, of which a list is given at the end of each volume. The question remains, how many more errors still lurk in the Maian text of the Septuagint? We have a right to ask this question after our experience of the unsatisfactory way in which the Roman editors have put forth the text of the New Testament, 'ex antiquissimo Codice Vaticano.' 'Ex' assuredly, for often their readings are not *in*.

There is another point which may be noticed. The long lacunæ at the commencement of Genesis and in the Psalms, as also the Books of the Maccabees, are filled up by the illustrious Cardinal from other MSS. As these MSS. are mentioned *both* in the preface and in footnotes to the text, the scholar has no cause to complain; and, moreover, the commencement and conclusion of each supplemented passage is specified by a mark in the text; still it would have been safer if in each supplemented page there had been some friendly mark of warning, or some difference in the type, to prevent an unwary reader, who happened to consult the Maian text in the *middle* of one of these long passages, from thinking that he was reading the text of a fourth century MS. instead of one much later. We observe that the Book of Daniel, ex Codice Chisianò, is printed in smaller type. We wish that this had been done with the supplemented passages.

We subjoin in a footnote the more remarkable inscriptions and subscriptions to the different books in the Septuagint version, as given in the Codex Vaticanus.²

¹ Professor Tischendorf calls attention to the variations between the fac-simile page prefixed to the Cardinal's work and the Cardinal's text. (Prol. xcii.) Gen. xlv. 31. Facs. *ηκασιν*; text, *ηκασι*. 34. Facs. *απαβια*; text, *απαβιας*. xlvii. 5. Facs. *κατοικιτωσαν*; text, *κατοικειτωσαν*. 6. Facs. *ηκασιν*; text, *ηκασι*. 7. Facs. *ευλογησεν*; text, *ηυλογησεν*. 13. Facs. *ενισχυσεν*; text, *ενισχυσε*. Six variations in seventeen verses. (!) These are, however, corrected in the Appendix to vol. i. except the first and third instances.

² Subsc. *γενεσις κατα τους εβδομηκοντα*. Insc. and Subsc. *ιησους υιος ναυη*. Insc. and Subsc. *εσδρας α, εσδρας β*, including Nehemiah, which in the text goes

These two MSS., the Codex Alexandrinus and the Codex Vaticanus, are the most remarkable among the uncial MSS. cited in the edition of Holmes and Parsons, and they are still the two main pillars of the Septuagintal text.

We will now request the attention of our readers to two more uncial MSS., which have been brought to light since the publication of Holmes' and Parsons' edition of the Septuagint.

We have so very lately described the Ephraem Rescript, that we need only refer our readers to a former number of this Review¹ for a general account of that remarkable document. The materials which this resuscitated witness furnishes towards determining the text of the Septuagintal version are (alas!) very scanty indeed, but they are most valuable.

The Old Testament portion was written by a different hand from that which wrote the New Testament, but is probably of the same date. It seems never to have contained more than the five poetical books; these were written stichometrically, as is the case in other MSS, and were called *βίβλοι στιχηραί*. They embrace Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song; besides these, the MS. also had the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus, son of Sirach. These are also written stichometrically, as in the Codex Alexandrinus. But of the original contents of the MS. we have now only a few fragments remaining. The Psalms are entirely lost: the fragments of Job are contained in nineteen leaves, of Proverbs in six, of Ecclesiastes in eight, of the Song in one, of the Wisdom of Solomon in seven, of the Wisdom of Sirach in twenty-three. The general character of the text seems to hold a middle place between that of the Alexandrine and that of the Vatican. It very often agrees with the Alexandrine against the Vatican; most frequently in Job, Proverbs, Song, Ecclesiastes, less frequently in Siracides, much less so in Wisdom. On the other hand, there are many instances where the Rescript agrees with the Vatican against the Alexandrine. There are instances where it differs from both. The peculiar readings are found mostly in the Apocryphal Books.²

on continuously from what precedes: but a later hand has inserted *επταυθεν τα περι νεεμιου*. Insc. *ψαλμοι* Subsc. *βιβλος ψαλμων ρν*. Then follows a short psalm, with the inscription, *ουτος ο ψαλμος εις δανειδ και εξωθεν του αριθμου οτε εμονομαχησεν τω γολιαθ*.—*προλογος* (to Siracides). Insc. *σοφια σιραχ*. Subsc. *σοφια ιησου νιου σιραχ*.

¹ See *Christian Remembrancer*, No. cxviii. p. 273.

² Noticeable points are Job, Subsc. *ιωβ*; Proverbs, Subsc. *παροιμια σολομωντος παρα εβδομηκοντα*; Ecclesiastes, Insc. and Subsc. *εκκλησιαστης*; Song, Insc. *ασμα ασματων*.

The subscription to the Wisdom of Solomon, *σοφια σολομωντος*. Inscription to the Prologue of Siracides, *προλογος σιραχ*. Inscription to the Book of Siracides, *σοφια ιησου νιου σιραχ*.

The other uncial MS. which we now proceed to notice is the Codex Friderico-Augustanus, a most interesting MS., not only on account of its antiquity and value, but from its relation to the Codex Sinaiticus.

The Codex Friderico-Augustanus was published in fac-simile by Professor Tischendorf, in 1846, at Leipzig. We shall, in the first instance, merely state what is to be learned from that edition, reserving other matters till afterwards. Let us suppose ourselves, then, in 1846, with the large volume before us.

From the prolegomena and text the following particulars may be gathered:—The MS. is written on very thin parchment, made of antelope skin; in each page are four columns, so that, when the volume is opened, eight collateral columns meet the eye. The characters, which of course are uncial, resemble those found in the Herculean papyrus rolls and the fragments of the Parisian Pentateuch; as also do certain marks (>) connected with the punctuation of the MS. The orthography, the grammatical forms, even the errors in writing, point to an Egyptian, perhaps an Alexandrian, origin; and it may be added in confirmation, that the parchments appear to have been always in Egypt or the neighbourhood. With regard to the probable age of the MS. the following data may be collected. The uncial letters are simple and elegant, resembling, as was said, those found in the Herculean papyri. The initial letters of paragraphs are not distinguished in size from the others, though they project slightly to the left of the column. There is very little punctuation. There are four columns to a page. There are the usual abbreviations $\overline{\theta}$ s, &c. The first corrector seems to have been of the same date as the original scribe. The second and third correctors appear to be some centuries later; but they do not use accents, and their letters resemble those of the

The fragments contain the following forms of words, which more or less illustrate readings found in the older MSS. of the New Testament:—

Consonants doubled, φαννει, φαννεν, διαβεννεις, βαλλαντιον, αποκτεννι. ***

Vowels changed, τεσσαρα, αροτριοντας, καλαμουμενος (spicas colligens), [χε]ισφιλου for χρεωφειλου, ολεθρευων, εξολεθρευσασιν.

Neglected augment, μεταβαλλετο, εκκεντριζοντο, προσκαλεσαμην, επερωτησας, ευοδωσεν, διορθωσαν, εορακα, ερυσατο.

Augment doubled or transposed, ηγαυριωντο (for εγαυριωντο), επαρεκαλουν, επροφητευσεν, διηνεακτο (ανεακτο rec.) διηλαβοντο, ηυλογησεν, ηυφρανθη.

Addition of ν to accus. sing. ασεβην (Sir. xlii. 2), χειραν (Wisd. xi. 20), (Cf. τιναν, Lk. xxi. 2. A).

Aspirates neglected, ουκ υπομινουσιν, ουκ ο φοβος, ουκ ευρεθησαν, ουκ ομοια, ουκ υπερηρει.

Aspirate added, αφηλπισεν.

Government by conjunctions neglected, ινα επαποστρεφονται, ινα δεσποζει, εως συντριψη και ανταποδιδωσι, μηποτε ποιηση και κατασχυνει, ινα ευοδωσει, εαν ενιστευσει, μη καταδεσμευσεις, ινα κοπιασει.

There occur αχριον, λαρυξ, αβωδηση.

sixth and seventh centuries. On these grounds, combined with the general appearance of the parchment, ink, &c., Professor Tischendorf pronounced, in 1846, the date of the MS. to be 'medio fere sæculo quarto.'

The first page with which the fragments commence is headed ΕCΔΡΑC Β. and it commences with 1 Chron. xi. 22, [κα] βασιλη ουτος επαταξεν, and goes on to 1 Chron. xix. 17, και επολεμησεν αυτον. Then continuously in the very same line commences 2 Esd. ix. 9, with the words $\kappa\varsigma$ \bar{o} $\theta\varsigma$ ημων, and the MS. goes on to the end of that book, $\epsilon\tilde{\xi}$ αυτων υιους. Nehemiah goes on in the same column, next line, without any break beyond that of a mere paragraph. Nehemiah is completed in fol. 13 (= p. 26), in the third column. The headings, where they occur, being still $\epsilon\sigma\delta\rho\alpha\varsigma$ β, and the subscription at the end of Nehemiah being the same. In the fourth column of the same folium comes the heading ΕCΘΗΡ, and the Book of Esther is completed at fol. 19 (= p. 38), column 2, with the subscription $\epsilon\sigma\theta\eta\rho$. In the same fol., column 3, is the heading ΤΦΒΕΙΘ: the Book of Tobit commences, but breaks off at the end of the fourth column on the obverse side, with the words των αδελφων ημων, Tob. ii. 2. Then follows a long fragment from Jeremiah x. 25, $\epsilon\pi\iota$ γενεας, to the end, with subscription $\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\mu\iota\alpha\varsigma$. In the next column comes the heading, ΘΡΗΝΟΙ ΙΕΡΕΜΙΟΥ, and the fragments end with Lam. ii. 20, $\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\alpha$ και προφη. Thus, then, it appears that the Codex Friderico-Augustanus contains, under the heading of $\epsilon\sigma\delta\rho\alpha\varsigma$ β, a fragment of 1 Paral., of 2 Esd., and all Nehemiah, also Esther complete, a fragment of Tobit, a fragment of Jeremiah, a fragment of Lamentations. Thus much may be gathered from what Professor Tischendorf published in 1846.

Now let us carry ourselves onward to 1855. In this year the same editor published, in his Monumenta Sacra, a fragment of the Codex Friderico-Augustanus, containing the end of Isaiah and the beginning of Jeremiah. In his prolegomena he says that, at the time he obtained possession of the Friderico-Augustanus, he also saw another part of the same MS., containing Isaiah, Jeremiah, Tobit, Judith, and all four Books of the Maccabees, 'omnesque quatuor Maccabæorum libros.' Of this other part he could not obtain possession, but he copied out at the time the end of Isaiah and the beginning of Jeremiah. As he could not afterwards find out what became of this other part, he published, in 1855, the very short fragment which he had copied in his first visit to the East.

It will be observed that the learned editor is a little chary of dates and places in the foregoing account.

But five years later these desiderata are fully supplied. In

1860 appeared his 'Notitia editionis codicis bibliorum Sinaitici.' From this it appears that in May, 1844, he visited the monastery of S. Catharine, at Mount Sinai, and saved from the waste-paper basket the venerable parchments, then on the high road to the monks' stove (or oven), which he afterwards published (1846) under the title of the Codex Friderico-Augustanus. But he then, *i.e.* in May, 1844, saw larger parts of the same codex, in which were contained the Books of Isaiah complete, and the Books of the Maccabees 'cum aliis.' These larger parts he could not then obtain; so he copied, as was said, a very short portion. In 1853, he paid a second visit to the monastery, but could not then find the remains which he had seen in 1844, nor could he learn what had become of them; so he published in 1855 the leaf which he had copied in 1844. In 1859, he paid a third visit to the monastery, and on the 4th of February discovered the very fragments of the Old Testament which he had saved from the basket in 1844, and which he could not find in 1853. With these fragments of the Old Testament were found the New Testament complete, the epistle of Barnabas in full, and the first part of the Shepherd.

The remains of the Old Testament comprise part of chapters ix., x., xi., in 1 Chron. Tobit complete *from the very point where the Codex Friderico-Augustanus breaks off.* The Book of Judith complete. The first and the fourth Books of Maccabees complete. The whole of Isaiah. Six leaves containing part of Jeremiah. Nine of the minor prophets, all the βίβλοι στιχηρεῖς, with the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Sirach, written two columns to a page.

It thus appears that the Codex Friderico-Augustanus, published in 1846, is part and parcel of the MS. which originally contained both it and the Codex Sinaiticus. The latter has been publicly stated by Dr. Simonides to be a document written by himself (!). If this be true, so was also the Codex Friderico-Augustanus written by him. How comes it that from 1846 to 1862 Dr. Simonides never published a word (so far as we know) to impugn the genuineness of this document?

We subjoin in a note remarkable readings and forms of words from the Codex Friderico-Augustanus.¹

With this brief notice of the four principal uncial MSS. of the Septuagint we now conclude this part of our subject. Our

¹ 1 Par. xii. 31. φυλους | 36. τεσσαρακοντα | xiii. 13. το κιβωτον | xiv. 9. συνεπεσαν | xv. 29. πεζονταν | xvi. 16. ισακ | 35. εσωσεν ημας ο θεος ο σωτηρ ημων for εσωσεν ημας, ο θεος της σωτηριας ημων | xvii. 4. τον παιδα μου | σου for συ | 5. κατα οικησα | 6. οικοδομηκατε | 8. εξωλεθρευσα | 9. αδικια for υιος αδικιας | 10. τε for σοι | 13. λαον for υιον, 1. m. | 17. επιδες—27. σοι for συ | xviii. 6. κατα δαμασκω | xix. 3. εξεραυνησωσιν | 6, 15. ιδον; | 16. ιδεν | 10. γεγοναν | 13. ποιησαι, opt. for ποιησει | 16. ενπροσθεν.

readers are, of course, aware that the great repertory for collations of the Septuagintal MSS. is the large edition, of which the first volume was published at Oxford, in 1798, edited by Holmes, and volumes 2—5 at Oxford, 1810—1827, edited by Parsons. It is to be regretted that the credit of this laborious and costly edition does not stand so high as its appearance would seem to warrant. We do not pretend to have compared the variæ lectiones given in this edition, with the original authorities, and must, therefore, content ourselves with citing the remarks made by the most recent editor of the Septuagint. Speaking of the collations made for this edition, Professor Tischendorf says (Prol. p. liii.), ‘Eæ vero quemadmodum in editis habentur non modo universæ graviter differunt inter se fide atque accurate, sed ad ipsos principales testes tam negligenter tamque male factæ sunt ut etiam atque etiam dolendum sit tantos nummos [7,000L.] raro liberalitate per Angliam suppeditatos criticæ sacræ parum profuisse.’ And he draws the following conclusion:—‘Itaque ut ad apparatus perveniantur ejusmodi, unde textus Veteris testamenti Græci tum antiquissima ratio ea qua per antiquos testes licet probabilitate restituatur tum historia accurate discatur, non ab opere Holmesiano, ut jam supra diximus, sed a novis circa ipsos testes studiis criticis proficiendum est.’ (P. lv.)

The limits of this article will not allow us to do more than notice very briefly the edition of the Septuagint put forth by Mr. Field for the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (1859). We gather from Mr. Field’s prolegomena that this edition was rather *done to order*, than executed according to his own ideas. The Society determined to take for the archetype of its text the edition published at Moscow in 1821. We quoted, at the commencement of this article, Mr. Field’s own remarks on this determination of the Society. It will be remembered that the Moscow edition was framed according to Grabe’s text, which, as is known, was based on the Alexandrine MS., and supplemented by readings from other sources. The Moscow edition, however, omitted the marks in the text by which Grabe had distinguished his supplemented or corrected passages.¹ Mr.

Εσθ. II. x. 9. ενατος | 14. ελθαιωσαν | 1. m. απο συναγωγων, for απο συνταγων.

Nehem. i. 6. ηρεωχημενοι | νυκταν | 7. εδελυσσαμεν 1. m. | 11. ευνοχος 1. m. for ονοχος | ii. 3. ειπον for ειπα | 15. χειμαρρους for χειμαρρου | 17. διακοδομησομεν | 18. αγαθα 1. m. for αγαθη | 19. ηλθαν ειπαν | iii. 1. 1. m. πυργους for πυργου | 1. m. ιχθυραν for ιχθυηραν (ιχθυηραν for ιχθυραν, xii. 39) | 8. πλατεις for πλατους | 29. της ανατολας | iv. 16. 1. m. επιουν for εποιουν | 17. βολιδαν | 21. ημισοι | 22. εμμεσω | v. 2. λημφομεθα | viii. 6. ευλογησεν xi. 2. ηυλογησεν | 12. 1. m. πιν, for πειν | 15. δασεις, for δασεος | ix. 8. ευρας | 13. ευθεια, for ευθεα, | 35. εαυτων for αυτων, and in other places | xi. 1. 1. m. ελαβοσαν | xiii. 10. αγρον εαυτων, for αγρον αυτου | 11. ειπον, for ειπα | πυρρον, for πυρου | 23. ιδον.

¹ Except the [], altered, however, to ().

Field makes Grabe's text the basis for his edition, and has corrected Grabe's errors as respects the Alexandrine MS., by references made to Baber's fac-simile, to the MS. itself, and to Tischendorf's edition. Besides these corrections, he has also introduced emendations of the text, chiefly from collations of the Codex Vaticanus, Mai's edition not having come into his hands until he had reached the prophet Ezekiel. But Mr. Field has omitted the marks by which Grabe distinguished the supplemented matter.¹ By way of ascertaining the character of Mr. Field's text, let us take the first four verses in the eighth chapter of Joshua. Here, of course, we expect to find him departing from the Sixtine text wherever the Alexandrine MS. does so, except in those cases where he prefers to follow the Vatican text. But we find more than this. Mr. Field's text departs *both* from the Alexandrine and the Vatican *six* times in four verses. Thus in Josh. viii. 1, after the words τὸν βασιλέα Γαί, Mr. Field inserts the words καὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτοῦ. They are not in the Sixtine text, or in A or B. They are printed in small type in Grabe, and marked *.

2. For τὴν Γαί, Mr. Field reads τῇ Γαί καὶ τῷ βασιλεὶ αὐτῆς. A. reads τη γαι, but neither the Sixtine, A., B., have the latter words. Grabe prints them in small type, with * prefixed.

2. For κτηνῶν, Mr. Field reads κτηνῶν αὐτῆς, differing herein from the Sixtine, A., B., which omit αὐτῆς. Grabe prints αὐτῆς in small type, with *.

2. For ὀπίσω, Mr. Field reads ὀπίσω αὐτῆς. Sixtine, A.B. omit αὐτῆς. αὐτῆς is printed in small type in Grabe, but without *.

4. For λέγων, Mr. Field reads λέγων Ἴδετε. Sixtine, A., B., omit ἴδετε. Grabe prints ἴδετε in small type with *.

4. For ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως, Mr. Field reads, ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως σφόδρα, Sixtine, A., B. omit σφόδρα. Grabe prints σφόδρα in small type, with *.

The insertions above noticed have not, then, the authority of the two principal uncial MSS. of the Septuagint. It is true that on referring to the Hebrew we find these insertions correspond to words employed there; but we are not told by what *Greek MSS.* these insertions are supported, though authorities may be found in Holmes and Parsons; and therefore this edition does not appear to amount to more than a recension of Grabe's text brought into close agreement with the Hebrew original, to suit the convenience of the general reader. The order of the books of the Old Testament is given according to

¹ The [] are retained to denote words or sentences not found in the Hebrew: e. g. Gen. i. 14 [καὶ ἔρχεν τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς]: Josh. i. 8 [εὐδοκῆσθαι, καὶ].

the order in the Authorized English Version. This, as is well known, is the order neither in the Hebrew Canon, nor in the Septuagint Version. It is undoubtedly convenient to the English reader for reference, but we are not aware of any ancient authority for the transposition. So, again, the Apocryphal books have been separated from the text of the Septuagint where they are found, some of them, intermingled with the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, but their order, in Mr. Field's edition, is not the same as in the English Version.

There are some valuable remarks, in Mr. Field's prolegomena on the subject of orthography, &c., but his text seems hardly to have enough of authority for critical purposes. Indeed, his edition does not profess to be a critical one.

V. CONCLUSION.—What, then, are the general conclusions to which the foregoing observations seem to guide us?

If we had the original translation, just as it came from the translators' hands, it would be difficult, indeed, to over-estimate its value. We all feel the influence which our own Authorized Version (in spite of certain defects) has exercised upon our own branch of the Church. If, by the lapse of time, that version had become interpolated or corrupted, we should be most thankful if any one were able to restore to us that original version which (thank God) we possess in its integrity. In like manner, if we consider the influence which the Septuagint Version exercised, first upon the scattered members of the Jewish religion for two centuries before the coming of our Lord, then for about four centuries afterwards upon the Christian Church, either immediately, or mediately through other derived versions; it must be confessed that the possession of the Septuagint text, as it existed in the earliest times, would be a most valuable addition to our theological stores.

But we have not that original text. It had become much altered in the time of Origen; his well-intended and most laborious efforts only ended in making matters worse. The two principal uncial MS. copies of the Septuagint Text, which we possess, are one of the fourth, the other of the fifth, century. The other uncial MSS. are extremely fragmentary. The current text is not framed on a comparison of the MSS. which we have, but represents very imperfectly one MS., and others, some of which are hardly known. It may be premature to attempt a restoration of the original text at present; but this we might do: we might verify our existing evidence from MSS., from versions, and from citations in other works; we might increase that evidence and arrange it: we might thus prepare the work for our successors, as the labours of Holmes, Parsons, Baber, and Mai have helped to smooth the way for us. Such a work might

worthily engage the attention of Hellenistic and Semitic scholars; it would, if well performed, be a great help to Biblical criticism, and reflect credit upon both our Universities. One end, however, such labourers should keep in view, namely, to approximate to the original translation, regardless of whether it agrees in all points with the present Hebrew text. What is wanted is the original independent witness of the LXX. translators, so far as authentic documents enable us to approximate to it: not an artificial version, manufactured to fit close to the Masoretic text.¹

It may be asked, If the present Septuagint text cannot be regarded as authoritative, is it worth while to devote much attention to it? We think there are weighty reasons to show that it is extremely worthy of our study. Even on mere philological grounds, it is a matter of great interest to trace the rise of the *ἡ κοινὴ* or *ἐλληνικὴ διάλεκτος* (based on the Attic dialect) in the written style of the Greek language after the time of Alexander the Great and his successors; and the vestiges that remain to us of that fusion of dialects in the spoken Greek of the same period, the source, perhaps, of some peculiarities in the style of the writers of the Septuagint and New Testament. Specially worthy of notice is the action of Oriental thought and of Oriental diction upon the language of Greece, and the changes brought about in that language by Egyptian and Syrian influences. But there are higher grounds than these. For, first the LXX. version does, even in its present state, preserve to us the substance of the Old Testament. Next, it is undoubtedly quoted by the writers of the New Testament, sometimes in cases where it differs from the Hebrew. But, chiefly, the Septuagint version is that by which God prepared the Greek language to stereotype the truth of the Gospel, till 'tongues shall cease.' And it is still the great magazine from which the language of the New Testament can be illustrated. Whatever may be the dislocation which particular parts of the Septuagint may have sustained; however difficult, if not impossible, it may be to construe many of its renderings; however obscure some of its terminology remains; yet, on the other hand, it cannot be denied, that terms and constructions occur throughout the text in such abundance that their genuineness cannot be doubted; that words of peculiar theological import occur whose meaning can be ascertained on sound critical methods, and that these words are also used by the New Testament writers in the same sense.

¹ An edition of the Sixtine text, with readings, in foot-notes, from the principal *Uncials*, would be a good first step, and would not be very laborious. We respectfully offer this suggestion to the Delegates of the Oxford University Press.

For instance, the titles of *κύριος, χριστός, παντοκράτωρ, ὑψίστος, αἰώνιος, μονογενής, ἀγαπητός, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,*

The words *σὰρξ, ψυχή, ξύλον, ἄδης, μεσότης, ἐκκλησία, συναγωγή, διάβολος,*

The doctrinal notions, the central points of which are *ἰλασμός, ἄφεσις, λύτρωσις, πίστις, μετάνοια, δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοῶ, ἁγιασμός,* receive, more or less, their illustration from the Septuagint.¹ Some of these particulars we may hereafter attempt to elucidate. For the present we take our leave of the subject, satisfied if our remarks have tended to convince our readers that the Septuagint possesses definite claims on the attention of all those who wish to become proficient in Biblical criticism.

¹ Again, observe how an appeal to the Septuagint will sometimes determine a rendering: *c. g.*

In Mat. ii. 1, *μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν.* This plural form is constant in the Septuagint sometimes with *ἡλίον.* Is. xi. 14. *θάλασσαν ἅμα προνομήσουσι, καὶ τοὺς ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν.*

But in the next verse S. Mat. has, *τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ.*

Meyer quotes Hammond, Paulus, Fritzsche, Glöckl, Ebrard, Wiseler, Langes, Ewald, &c. for translating 'im Aufgehen,' in its rising; and declares in their favour on the ground that 'im Oriente' would require *ἐν ταῖς ἀνατολαῖς.*

Alford (4th ed. 1859) renders 'in the East' referring to verse 9. But the point is made certain by Neh. iii. 29, *φύλαξ· τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἀνατολῆς,* for *ἡμεῖς.*

Add Jer. xxxviii. (LXX.) [= 31 Heb.] 40, *ὥς γωνίας πόλεως ἵππων ἀνατολῆς: 3 Kings, vii. 25 καὶ οἱ τρεῖς ἐπιβέποντες ἀνατολήν.* Rev. xvi. 12 (B. C.) *ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου* and Rev. xxi. 13 (A) *ἀπο ἀνατολῆς πυλῶνες τρεῖς:* this is also the reading in Stephens' text.

ART. III. — *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature.*
Second Series. Vol. VII. Part 1.

THERE was once a time when the battle-cry, 'S. George for merrie England!' roused up the soldier's courage, in somewhat a like manner that Nelson's famous signal stimulated the British sailor to fight for the honour and glory of his country. Though that war-cry is no longer heard, still there waves over England's army the blood-red cross of S. George, and still her noblest sons deem it the highest honour to be enrolled among the knights of S. George; still does the garter, with its quaint legend, '*Honi soit qui mal y pense*,' surround the royal arms of our monarch; and still does S. George's Chapel, at Windsor, recall the mighty memories of past glory, and proclaim that yet, amid the change of opinion, the revolutions of government, the march of intellect, S. George remains our patron saint, and holds his honoured place in the mightiest empire of the world. Still is the Chapter of that noble order held on S. George's Day (Ap. 23) in S. George's Chapel, with all its ancient ceremonies; still is the Bishop of Winchester Prelate of the order, the Bishop of Oxford¹ Chancellor, and the Dean of Windsor Dean, and the Heir of England has just been married in S. George's Chapel, habited in the robes of a Knight of the Garter. Still have we 162 of the old parish churches dedicated to his memory, and many also in later times—two to SS. Mary and George, one to SS. George and Laurence, one to SS. George and Edmund.

No doubt much of this is owing to that strong conservative spirit, which so characterises our countrymen, which induces them to keep up ancient customs and ancient traditions, not always because they are good and useful, but because they are old and belong to their forefathers—a disposition which often makes them cling to abuses, and unreasoningly oppose real improvement.

It is not to be expected that, amid the changes and revolutions that took place in the sixteenth century—when almost everything that was old and venerable was called in question, and what was not in the Bible was denounced as superstitious, and men confounded the lawful use of a thing with its abuse—that S. George's claim to be the patron saint of England should pass unchallenged. The first that attempted to cast a slur on the memory of S. George was that learned, but highly prejudiced, pope of the Reformed community of Geneva, John Calvin. He says, '*Nil eos Christo reliquum facere qui pro nihilo ducunt*

¹ The Bishop of Salisbury was *ex officio* Chancellor: but in the recent redistribution of dioceses, Berkshire was transferred from Salisbury to Oxford.

'ejus intercessionem, nisi accedant Georgius aut Hippolitus, aut 'similes larvæ.'¹ Calvin was followed by Dr. Reynolds, in his work, '*De Idolatria Ecclesie Romanæ*,' in which—unable to get over the fact that S. George is spoken of by so many ancient writers as a real person, yet unwilling to lose the opportunity of a blow at the Roman Church—he contents himself by asserting that the S. George honoured by the Mediæval Church, made the patron saint of England, was that Arian Bishop set up by the heretical faction at Alexandria to supplant S. Athanasius—an assertion equally dishonourable both to the memory of S. George, and to the English empire, with the more sweeping statement of Calvin, that he was a nonentity. These slanders, cast upon our patron saint, roused up the learned Dr. Heylyn to investigate the true history of S. George; which he did with his usual diligence and accuracy: his '*Historie of that most famous Saint and Soldier of Christ Jesus, S. George of Cappadocia*;' asserted from the Fictions of the Middle Ages of the Church, and opposition of the present,' passed through two editions; the second, published in 1633, was dedicated to King Charles I., and contains an appendix on the 'Order of S. George, called the Garter.' This work amply fulfils its promise, and ought to have set the question at rest for ever; but errors, like weeds, grow again after being plucked up; for we find Dr. John Pettingal, in a work '*On the Original of the Equestrian Figure of S. George, and of the Garter*,' published in 1753, and dedicated to George II., saying, 'Whether our S. George was an Arian, or whether he was a real person or not, 'is a matter not settled among the learned.' He, in turn, was answered by Dr. Samuel Pegge, in 1777, who read a paper before the Society of Antiquarians, proving that S. George was not a fictitious character: in it he also points out the entire hollowness of the ingenious conjecture of Mr. Byrom, that 'George' is a mistake for 'Gregory' the Great, whose claim to be the patron saint of England he supports; while, incidentally, he repeats the old assertion that George the Arian is our

¹ Cal. Instit. lib. iii. cap. xx. § 27. The word 'larva' has given rise to some dispute: in the translation by Norton (1585) it is rendered 'visions.' Heylyn gives 'counterfeits.' The word seems to be derived from the old Etruscan word 'Lar,' or 'Lars,' king or chief; from whence came 'Lares,' the presiding genii of a household or family. These were, apparently, the ghosts of the founders of the family, or some renowned ancestor whom the family deified. Thus 'Lavati' were men possessed by demons. Festus describes them as 'furiosi, et mente moti, quasi larvis exterriti.' Plautus, (Captiv. act iii. sc. iv. v. 65.) 'Jam deliramenta loquitur; larvæ simulant virum.' Amphit. act ii. sc. ii. v. 144, 'Larvarum pleni.' From this it appears that a 'larva' is the ghost of some one departed, and supposed to possess some one living: a belief existing to this day among certain magicians (Aïssous) in North Africa, who, after certain incantations, imagine themselves to be possessed by the spirit of a deceased marabout.

S. George the Martyr.¹ It is, however, owing to a passage in Gibbon that the mistake of the identity of S. George is most widely spread and most firmly rooted. That writer, after giving a short account of George the Arian, his infamous life, and bloody end, could not refrain from giving a back-handed stroke to the Church—though he had Heylyn's work and that of the Bollandists before his eyes, for he refers to them in a note: he says, 'The odious stranger, disguising every circumstance of time and place, assumed the mask of a martyr, a saint, and a Christian hero; and the infamous George of Cappadocia has been transformed into the renowned S. George of England, the patron of arms, of chivalry, and of the garter.'² This is not the only instance in which oft-repeated slander has borne down an oft-repeated truth.

It is not to be doubted that the legendary history of S. George, his famous combat with the dragon, and all the quaint stories of the 'Champion of England,' have had something to do with the disrepute into which the saint has fallen; nor can we wonder that any one acquainted only with it should suspect that he was a mere myth, a *larva*. It will, for many reasons, be most convenient to take the legendary history first, and show how it arose, and then investigate the true.

In the 'Seven Champions of Christendom' we have a curious specimen of the style of romance which once delighted our forefathers; in which consistency, probability, nay, possibility, were utterly ignored; chronology, geography, completely set at defiance. Shakespeare has been laughed at for describing a shipwreck on the deserts of Bohemia; but this is a mere *lapsus* to the utter contempt of all history and topography displayed in this famous legend. Thus, while we have a black king of Morocco, whose dominions bordered on Egypt, we have a Jewish king at Jerusalem, a Mohammedan soldan of Persia, a Christian emperor at Constantinople, and a Pagan king of Thracia! Of course, the utmost liberty is given to giants, dragons, wizards, and necromancers: the whole apparatus of the improbable is set in motion to show off the glory and prowess of the Christian knights. An accomplished critic might, no doubt, find under all this a deep and beautiful moral, just as the Franciscan Walleys did, when he wrote a moral and theological exposition of the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid. It is, however, evident that the writer, or writers, of the 'Seven Champions' had no such intention: they wrote for the amusement of their readers.

The legend begins by relating the birth and parentage of the

¹ On the Patron of England, in a Letter to Lord Willoughby, President of the Antiquarian Society.—Byrom's Poems, vol. i. p. 100, ed. 1772.

² Gibbon's Hist. Decline and Fall, c. xxiii.

hero: first telling us the origin of the British nation—following the narrative of Geoffry of Moumouth, who, more anxious for the glory of his country than for truth, would induce his readers to derive their origin, as Virgil did the Roman, from the ruins of the Trojan race. ‘The noble and adventurous Brute, fourth in descent from Æneas, first conquered the island of Britain, then inhabited with monsters, giants, and a kind of wild people, without any form of government.’ The monarchy of Britain being established, and civilization introduced by the ‘noble Brute,’ our hero was born. Of course, prodigies attended his birth. His mother, the Countess of Coventry, wife of the Lord High Steward of England, dreamed that she had conceived a dragon, which should cause her death. Her lord, disturbed at her dream, went to consult the enchantress Kalyb, who informed him that the son to be born would be a champion bold, of mighty deeds. Before his return the dream was fulfilled—the mother died in giving birth to a child, on whose breast was found the image of a dragon, on his left knee a golden garter, and on his right hand a blood-red cross. Soon after Kalyb contrived to steal him, and keep him in captivity till he was grown up. Then having deceived the enchantress, and got possession of her silver wand, he imprisoned her in a rock, set at liberty the six other champions of Christendom, and, encased in magic armour, girt with a magic sword, he sallies forth to seek adventures. Coming to the land of Egypt, he delivers the beauteous Sabra, daughter of the King of Egypt, from the dragon, which he kills after a terrible encounter. We need not follow the romance further. Heylyn conjectures, with all probability, that the slaughter of the dragon, and the deliverance of Sabra, is taken from the story of Perseus and Andromeda, as described by Ovid, *Met. lib. iv. 16.*

The legend, in some form, is as old at least as the thirteenth century, when it was brought into something of its present state by the well-known De Voragine, the author of the ‘Golden Legend.’ From him it seems to have crept into the service-books of the Church; for in the ‘*Horæ B. Mariæ, secundum usum Sarum,*’ we have the following hymn, appointed to be sung on S. George’s Day:

‘O Georgi Martyr inclyte,
Te decet laus et gloria,
Predotatum militia;
Per quem puella regia,
Existens in tristitia,
Coram Dracone pessimo,
Salvata est. Ex animo
Te rogamus corde intimo,
Ut cunctis cum fidelibus

Cœli jungamur civibus,
 Nostris ablatis sordibus :
 Et simul cum lætitia
 Tecum simus in gloria ;
 Nostraque reddant labia
 Laudes Christo cum gratia,
 Cui sit honos in secula.'

On the reformation of the Missals and Breviaries by Pope Clement VII., the story of the dragon was expunged, while the name of S. George was left as one of those 'qui cum Christo regnant.' In the missal, the introit is from Ps. lxi. The Collect, 'Deus, qui nos beati Georgii martyris tui meritis et intercessione lætificas ; concede propitius ut, qui tua per eum beneficia poscimus, dono tuæ gratiæ consequamur. Per.' The Epistle, 2 Tim. ii. 8—11, and iii. 10—13. The Gospel, S. John xv. 1—8.

The legend arose, perhaps, from a misunderstanding of an encomium or anniversary oration, made in memory of S. George, given by Metaphrastes, which concludes thus : 'Licebat igitur videre astutissimum Draconem, adversus carnem et sanguinem gloriari solitum, elatumque, et sese effertentem, a juvene uno illusum, et ita dispectum atque confusum, ut quid ageret non haberet.' Another writer, summing up the acts of S. George, says : 'Secundo quod Draconem vicit qui significat Diabolum ;' and Hospinian, relating the sufferings of the Martyr, affirms distinctly that his constancy was the occasion of the creation of the legend by Voragine.

Such is, briefly, as far as we can trace it, the origin of the legend. That it should soon become popular among people who really believed in the existence of dragons and monsters of that sort, we can easily imagine ; how it became so much so in England, we shall show presently. Once established as the patron saint of England, it would naturally happen that every kind of embellishment would follow, and, like Virgil's Fama, 'Viresque acquirit eundo.' Our great poet Spenser was not slow to avail himself of the popular belief, and, in his beautiful allegory of the 'Faerie Queene,' introduced S. George as Una's knight. Arrived at the 'Hill of Holinesse,' the aged hermit, whose name was 'Heavenly Contemplation,' discloses to him his birth :—

For well I wote thou springst from ancient race
 Of Saxon kinges, that have with mightie hand,
 And many bloody battailes fought in place,
 High reard their royall throne in Britaine land,
 And vanquisht them, unable to withstand :
 From thence a Faery thee unweeting reft,
 There as thou slepst in tender swadling band,
 And her base Elfin brood there for thee left :
 Such, men do chaungelings call, so chaunged by Faeries theft.

Thence she thee brought into this Faery Lond,
And in an heaped furrow did thee hyde ;
When thee a ploughman all unweeting fond,
As he his toylesome teme that way did guyde,
And brought thee up in ploughman's state to byde,
Whereof *Georgos* he thee gave to name ;
Till prickt with courage, and thy forces pryde,
To Faery Court thou cam'st to seek for fame,
And prove thy puissant armes, as seems thee best became.'

Then follows the history of his combat with the dragon, and the consequent delivery of *Una's* parents from captivity. Next we have his betrothal: the Red-cross Knight becomes the pledged husband to true religion, by his conquest of the dragon—his renunciation of the Devil. Now, before his marriage is consummated, he must go forth, at the command of the Faerie Queen, to fight against the world and the flesh.

The legend of the conquest of the dragon is of purely Western origin, for it is unknown in the East. Though *S. George* is an Eastern saint, and highly honoured in the Oriental Church, there is nothing known of his encounter with the dragon. This fact supports the view we have here taken, that the legend is not older than *Voragine* ; at any rate, subsequent to the great schism. The Greeks, however, have a legend peculiar to themselves. It seems that among them *S. George* was represented as seated on horseback, as early as the thirteenth century. For the story goes—it is related by *Nicephoras Gregoras*—that on the first Saturday in Lent, when the Church commemorated those emperors and patriarchs whose names were famous, the grand *Logothete* *Theodoros*, who was keeping vigil in church, was hastily sent for by the Emperor *Andronicos* the elder to interpret a strange omen, which had disturbed him and the whole court: this was, that a loud noise was heard like the neighing of a horse, which, it was discovered, proceeded from a picture of *S. George* on horseback ; and when the *Logothete* predicted success and glory to the emperor, *Andronicos* replied that the like phenomenon was witnessed when *Baldwin*, the Latin emperor, lost *Constantinople*.

We shall now proceed to give some account of *George* the Arian. This man seems to have been born in a fuller's mill at *Epiphania* in *Cilicia*. We first hear of him as purveyor of provisions for the army at *Constantinople*, where he assumed the profession of Arianism, the better, doubtless, to secure favour with the ruling powers ; from hence, being found out in certain peculations, he was obliged to fly, and take refuge in *Cappadocia*. He was not, however, deserted by his Arian friends, who, finding him well suited to carry out their purposes, managed to get his former offences condoned by paying a fine (or bribe—

μισθωσάμενοι is the word used by S. Athanasius, *Orat. i. contr. Arian.*), and had him sent to Alexandria, where, by his zeal and energy in forwarding the interests of his party, he was chosen Bishop, on the deposition of S. Athanasius, by the Emperor Constantius; or, perhaps, it is more correct to say, he succeeded the former Arian Bishop, Gregory. Here, associating with himself Dracontius, Master of the Mint, and the Count Diodorus, he tyrannized alike over the Catholics and the heathen; the former by torturing them to make them accept the Arian Creed, the latter by extorting money.

S. Athanasius gives us a terrible picture of his cruelties towards the Catholics: he entered Alexandria in the time of Lent, and there threw the sacred virgins into prison, and committed to the keeping of the soldiers the suffragan bishops. Immediately after Whitsuntide, when the Catholics were gathered to pray in the outer court of the church—for they refused to receive the Communion in the Church at the hands of the Arian priests—George sends out Sebastian, a Manichee, then captain of the guard, to compel them by force of arms to receive the mysteries. The veiled virgins, who still remained faithful, were stripped of their clothes, and beaten in the face: no less than forty men were savagely torn in pieces, others were banished; the bodies of the dead kept from burial.

He met with his death, however, at the hands of the heathen, who hated him equally with the Catholics, for his tyrannies and extortions. The occasion was this: the Emperor had given him leave to convert the Temple of Mithras into a church, and in so doing there were found several human bodies which had been sacrificed to that idol. These being exposed to public view in order to throw odium on the heathen worship, they, the heathen, fell upon George, and murdered him, it happening at that very time that his friend the Count had just died, the knowledge of which fact emboldened the people to rid themselves of their oppressor.

It is necessary to note, that there is very considerable confusion in various writers with regard to the acts of this George: sometimes he is confounded with his predecessor, Gregory, sometimes with another George, an Arian also, Bishop of Laodicea. Both of these Georges were present at the Council of Seleucia: the confusion is increased by both of them being called 'George of Cappadocia'—one from being really a native of that place, the other from his having come from thence to be made Bishop of Alexandria. We shall see, presently, how this similarity of name caused the latter to be confounded with the true S. George the Martyr.

Mr. Hogg, in the paper named at the head of our article,

gives quotations in full from the 'Chronicon Paschale,' Ammianus Marcellinus—that 'cool and impartial infidel,' as Gibbon calls him, and on whose testimony he chiefly relied—from S. Athanasius, S. Gregory Nazianzen, S. Epiphanius, Theophanes, and George Cedrenus; all of them confirming the history we have given above. We do not consider it necessary to quote them. We shall now proceed with the history of the true S. George, our patron saint and martyr.

S. George the Martyr was a native of Lydda, a town in Palestine; he was born of Christian parents, who were, apparently, people of some importance: when young he was taken to Cappadocia, where he passed the early part of his life,—thus giving occasion to be called a Cappadocian. We next find him serving in the army of the Emperor Diocletian, at Nicomedia, then the metropolis of the Eastern empire. At this place issued the famous edict of the emperor, which gave rise to what is termed the ninth persecution, in which S. George suffered. His body was afterwards conveyed to his native town, Lydda, and there honourably buried. S. George was then a beardless youth, but of considerable rank in the army. Heylyn conjectures that S. George is the martyr mentioned by Eusebius (Hist. L. viii. c. 5):—'No sooner was the edict, made against the Church, proposed in Nicomedia, but presently one of no common rank, but very high advanced in fortune and in worldly honours—moved with a zeal to God, and a lively faith—tore it in pieces, when it hanged in the open view, as profane and impious. And this he did, two of the emperors being then in the city, viz. Diocletian, which was the first, and Galerius Maximinianus, being the fourth in rank among them. This was the first who was ennobled for his sufferings at that time; on whom, no doubt, there was inflicted whatever punishment might be thought answerable to the fact, which he endured with the most quiet and untroubled mind, and so continued to the last.'¹ This brief narrative we believe to be nearly the whole of the authentic history of our saint. That he was early esteemed a saint we find by an inscription mentioned by Mr. Hogg:—

'In the year 1858, I was fortunately enabled, by a careful examination of the Greek inscription (No. 40, Trans. Royal Soc. Lit. vol. vi. p. 305) which Mr. Cyril Graham had, in the previous summer, copied from a very ancient church—originally a heathen temple—at Ezra, in Syria, to determine, most satisfactorily, that *Saint George* had died before the year A.D. 346, in which he was expressly called a 'Holy Martyr.' Also it is clear that this date occurred during the lifetime of the *other George*—the *Alexandrian bishop*—who survived for fifteen years longer, viz. to A.D. 362; and who then, having expiated his vices and base conduct by assassination, could not, under any consideration, be esteemed a martyr.'—P. 132.

¹ Heylyn, p. 150.

We have already given some answer to the question, How have these various legends become connected with the name of S. George? The answer we gave is not altogether satisfactory; for, besides that of the conquest of the dragon, there is also another very curious one—that, shortly before his martyrdom, he rescued the Empress Alexandra from the depths of hell by his prayers. Mr. Hogg suggests that, in the confusion of the two Georges, when the martyr S. George was confounded with the heretic bishop of Alexandria, the names connected with the latter were somehow mixed up with the former, and, in course of time, changed, and new stories attached to them.

‘Hence the confusion, whether designedly or erroneously, may have arisen from *both* Georges being reported to have been *from* or *in* Cappadocia; from the stories of the Empress *Alexandra*, of the city of Alexandria, and from the slaughter of the beast *Dragon*, and of the man *Dracontius*.’—P. 134.

This is not satisfactory: perhaps we shall find a better clue if we say something of how S. George became the patron saint of England. We take the following history from Heylyn, who quotes the ‘Black Book of Windsor.’ ‘When King Richard warred upon the Turks and Saracens, Cyprus and Acre, and was weary of so long delays, the siege continuing, and he full of trouble and anxiety, on a divine inspiration, by the coming in apparition of S. George, as he imagined, it came into his mind to draw upon the legs of certain choice knights of his a certain garter, or tack of leather, such only as he had then at hand. Whereby, being distinguished, and put in mind of future glory promised unto them, in case they won the victory, they might be stirred up and provoked to perform their service bravely, and fight more valiantly.’¹ We read of other apparitions of the saint in the earlier crusade under Godfrey de Bouillon; he was always known by his red-cross banner, and accompanied by a host of heavenly warriors. Whatever opinions we may have of the nature of these apparitions, we can easily see how likely it would appear to the minds of the Christian soldiers, fighting for the possession of the Holy Land, that a soldier-saint should help them, especially when they were in the immediate neighbourhood of his burial-place. The Hebrew prophet beautifully described the wife of Israel, and mother of Benjamin, weeping in the tomb, where she had lain for centuries, at the cruel slaughter of her posterity; and the Evangelist as beautifully again applies the sacred words to the martyred innocents of Bethlehem. In like manner the Christian warriors would easily imagine—if it were only an imagination—the soldier-saint

¹ Not having the original before us, we have given the translation as Heylyn gives it, only modernising the spelling; we leave it to our readers to correct the grammar.

of Palestine, rising from his tomb in full panoply, with his attendant host, and his red-cross banner, to help those who were toiling to redeem the Holy Land from the grasp of the infidel. We can readily see how he would, on the conquest of Jerusalem, and the return of many of the warriors to their homes in the West, be honoured as the soldiers' patron saint, and be placed at the head of a military order. We can understand how he would be invoked in future wars with the infidels, and how, to a mind like that of the chivalrous King Richard, the waking thoughts and prayers would still run in the sleeper's dreams, and devotion and enthusiasm would make real the visionary shadow, and turn the vivid impression of his imagination into a divine command.

Incidentally, these histories add their quota of evidence to the establishment of the facts we have been endeavouring to prove—viz. that S. George, the patron saint of England, was a real person and a real martyr, and that he is a wholly different person from George the Arian; for we find that it was universally believed by the Crusaders that his tomb was at Lydda; for after his apparition and assistance given to the crusading host, Godfrey created Lydda into an Episcopal see—a clear proof that at that time he was esteemed a Catholic saint and martyr. It is worthy of notice that the Mohammedans, no less than the Christians, honour him even to this day. The Greek imperial historian, Kantakuzenos, mentions the fact, that there were several shrines erected to his memory, at which the Mohammedans pay their devotion: the traveller Burckhardt relates, that 'the Turks pay great veneration to S. George,' by whom he is called 'El Khouder;' and Dr. Stanley speaks of a Mussulman sepulchral chapel (*marabout*) on the sea-shore, near Sarafend—the ancient Sarepta—dedicated to El Khouder, in which 'there is no tomb inside, only hangings before a recess. 'This variation from the usual type of Mussulman sepulchres 'was, as we were told by peasants on the spot, because El 'Khouder is not yet dead; he flies round and round the world, 'and those chapels are built wherever he has appeared.'¹

It was from the Crusaders, then, that the fame of S. George was spread over the West; he became the patron of soldiers, and was represented as such, generally, on horseback: monkish writers, and lovers of the marvellous, would quickly embellish his meagre history with romantic legends, and attribute to him deeds in accordance with their notions of what a soldier-saint of the middle ages should be. We have already said something of the probable origin of the story of his encounter with the dragon, but we cannot help adding another conjecture, that the

¹ Sinai and Palestine, p. 274.

popular and ignorant mind may have confounded the representation of S. Michael slaying the dragon—drawn, of course, from the Apocalypse—with that of S. George, and then invented a story, or adapted that of Perseus, from Ovid, to explain it. The mistake once made, we can easily guess the result; the patron saint of England must not be behind other saints in mighty deeds and famous renown.

For it was not only in England that S. George was thus honoured; at Constantinople and at Moscow he held an important place: in 1245, on S. George's Day, Frederic of Austria instituted an order of knights, in number two hundred; this was re-established or revived by the Emperor Rodolf of Hapsburg, some thirty years after, to protect the frontiers of his empire against the Turks. In England he was honoured as a saint long before he was constituted the patron: we find a monastery of S. George, and a church, at Thetford, which seem to have been founded in the reign of Knut; a collegiate church at Oxford, generally assigned to the reign of William the Conqueror; S. George's, Southwark, perhaps even older; the Priory of Griesley, in Derbyshire, dedicated to SS. Mary and George, in the reign of Henry I. Two of these, if not three, were dedicated before the first Crusade. S. George's Chapel, Windsor, founded by Edward III. in 1348, is too closely connected with the Order of the Garter to need further notice. Long before this, the fame of the soldier-saint was firmly established in England; the Crusade under Richard I. was in every way calculated to enhance it.

We cannot, however, attribute to King Richard either the patronage of S. George for England, or the establishment of the Order of the Garter, though we think it very likely that, when King Edward III. chose the Garter as the emblem of the Order, he had in remembrance the story of the apparition at Acre. The following history is taken from Thomas of Walsingham:—At the siege of Calais, in 1349, Edward III. moved by some sudden impulse, drew his sword, calling out 'Ha! Saint Edward! Ha! Saint George!' The words and the action communicating a like spirit to his soldiers, they fell fiercely on the French, routing them, and putting two hundred to the sword. From that time S. George was constituted the patron saint of England, and the celebrated order was instituted in the following year. In 1415, by the constitutions of Archbishop Chicheley, S. George's Day was made a *majus duplex*, and ordered to be observed as Christmas Day, all servile work ceasing; he is there styled *totius militiæ Anglicanæ spiritualis Patronus*. From this time 'By S. George!' became the common oath of an Englishman; and actually was the subject of a royal enactment in order to consolidate the conquest of Ireland.

We take the following from Heylyn exactly as we find it there:—‘These things, I say, I will not speake of, lest they may ‘give offence to our nicer eares; nor of more honours of this ‘lesser ranke or quality, afforded him in *England*: and therefore, ‘though the Sea be very troublesome and unruly, we passe ‘over Saint *Georges* Channell into Ireland. And here I shall ‘observe that onely, which I find in Master *Seldens* Notes ‘on the *Poly-Olbion*; as viz. that under Henry 8. it was ‘enacted; “that the Irish should leave their *Cramaboo*, and ‘*Butleraboo*, words of unlawfull Patronage: and name them- ‘selves as under Saint *George*, and the Kings of *England*.” A ‘masterie of no small moment, considering the untractable nature ‘of that people: and how tenaciouslie they adhere to their ‘antient customes.’

S. George being constituted patron saint of England, the King proceeded to institute the military Order of S. George, now generally known as that of the Garter. Froissart and the Black Book of Windsor both affirm that this Order was intended as a revival of that of King Arthur and the Round Table; in the latter we read:—‘*Arthurus arcem illam nobilem [Windsor] inchoavit et Rotundam ibi quam vocant Mensam instituit.* And Du Chesne from Froissart, says, ‘*Lequel [Windsor] ‘Artur, le grand Roy des Bretons avoit premièrement fondé ‘pour mettre la Table Ronde, autrefois si celebre, et renommée ‘par toute la terre.*’ These matters, as well as the origin of the Garter as the badge of the Order, we leave to be discussed by antiquarians, only adding that the story of the King picking up the Countess of Salisbury’s garter at a dance, and turning off the laughter of the bystanders by gallantly fastening it round his own knee, with the words, ‘*Honi soit qui mal y pense,*’ is an after invention, and has no foundation in history; yet we must confess that it is the only story that accounts for the motto.

S. George’s Day was kept as a red-letter day in our Church Kalendar till 1545, with its proper Collect, Epistle, and Gospel; in King Edward VI.’s reign it was altogether abrogated; and then the holding of the Chapter of the Garter on S. George’s Day was nearly gone too, for it was enacted that for the future the ‘Feast of the said Order should be celebrated on Whitsuneve, ‘Whitsun-day, and Whitsun-Monday, and not on S. George’s ‘Day, as before it was.’ In the following year, however, being the first of Queen Mary, this enactment was indignantly expunged:—‘*Omnia ista novitia Statuta e Statutorum Libro illico ‘eximeret, ac prorsus expungeret et deleteret, ne ulla unquam ‘eorum memoria apud posteros extaret.*’ Since which time the ancient custom has obtained, and S. George’s Day is still honoured by the holding on it of the Chapter of the Garter.

ART. IV.—*Twenty Years of Financial Policy; a Summary of the Chief Financial Measures passed between 1842 and 1861, with a Table of Budgets.* By SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, M.P. for Stafford. London: Saunders, Otley, and Co.

WE may accept with great satisfaction this addition, by Sir Stafford Northcote, to the history of our country. Few things, as he truly observes in the commencement of the volume, are more difficult than the study of the times which are just past, of which the history is yet unwritten. They are still too near our own days to be judged impartially. The thoughtful historian turns from them, feeling, like Hallam, 'content with 'compiling and selecting the records of the past, to shun the difficult and ambitious office of judging the present, or of speculating upon the future.' The task thus avoided by those who only could do justice to it, is either left unperformed, or too frequently assumed by the mere partisan.

Sir Stafford Northcote's book rises, however, far above the position of a mere party-pamphlet: it is broad and statesmanlike in tone and really interesting reading; although it might almost have been called, *A History of the Rise, Progress, and Continuance of the Income Tax*. The author says that it has been his intention to avoid controversy, and he has performed his self-imposed task with fewer deviations from the strict rule of impartiality, than could have been expected from one who was himself a main actor in many of the events which he chronicles. Allowance is also claimed for the natural repugnance of human nature to a mere 'reproduction of defunct budgets,' a labour so wearisome that Sir Stafford Northcote says he could not have got through his task 'without stepping a little aside, from time to time, to 'touch upon questions of principle, or even of party, arising out 'of the narrative.'

Not that the undertaking itself, the endeavour to estimate the course of taxation during the last twenty years—years which have probably witnessed far deeper changes among us than any equal period which ever preceded—is in any way unworthy the attention of a distinguished party-leader and expectant statesman. 'It is no baseness,' are the words of one of the deepest essays in the English language, 'for the greatest to descend and 'look into their own estate. Some forbear it, not upon negligence alone, but doubting to bring themselves into melancholy, 'in respect they shall find it broken. But wounds cannot be 'cured without searching.' And truly, if Sir Stafford North-

cote has not in his pages put forth a remedy for the evils he describes, he has, at all events, constructed a most useful work of reference for those who desire to perform the same kind of office for the State, which, it is to be hoped, they undertake in the management of their own affairs.

'The period reviewed is that commencing with Sir Robert Peel's imposition of the Income Tax in 1842, and extending to the repeal of the Paper Duties in 1861. The fortunes of the Income Tax, its origin, the change which has taken place in its character, and the work which has been done by its aid, give a kind of dramatic unity to this period, which would alone be sufficient to make the study of it interesting; but, in addition to this, we have in the course of these twenty years, seen our financial system exhibited in all its bearings; and examples have been given of almost every kind of financial problem. We have seen how large surpluses have been applied, and how large deficits have been met; we have had peace taxation and war taxation; loans of various kinds, contracted upon different principles; successful and unsuccessful operations upon the interest of the debt; we have repealed an enormous mass of taxation with one hand, and have laid on a still larger amount with the other; we have revised our commercial policy, and to some extent, our monetary policy also.'

The curtain draws up on a period of financial chaos, the result of piecemeal legislation. A deficiency of nearly two millions and a half was only one of a numerous family of such disturbers of the official repose of a Chancellor of the Exchequer;—the total deficiency of the preceding four years rising to nearly seven millions and a half, while this last deficit was particularly harassing, as it followed an increase in taxation, and appeared to indicate an exhaustion of the resources of the people. Nothing at this time appeared to benefit the Exchequer. In 1840 Mr. Baring had attempted to restore equilibrium by increasing, in 1841 he proposed the same result by diminishing, taxation; but both remedies failed.

Bewildered and exhausted, the nation placed implicit and well-deserved confidence in the measures of his successor, Sir Robert Peel. The speech with which he introduced the budget was a masterpiece of his style of argument. In the first place, he made it clear that no temporary expedients, no disguised loans, no issue of exchequer-bills, would meet the difficulties of the case. The experiments of his predecessor had proved, only too plainly, that the limits of taxation on articles of consumption had been reached: the taxes that had been abandoned could not be revived—those that had been lowered could not be raised. Nor could immediately increased revenue be sought for by reducing duties, in the expectation that enlarged consumption would supply the deficiency. Only one resource remained: property and income must bear their share of the burden. The income-tax—that powerful engine of taxation,

disused for more than a quarter of a century—must be reinstated: that, and that only, could restore a surplus.

Meanwhile, protected by this auxiliary, the duties on timber, coffee, and about 750 various articles in the tariff, could be reduced. In due time increased consumption would fill the void thus caused; and then the income-tax, a useful prop to support the tottering structure of finance till a more dependable support could be constructed, was to be laid aside, no longer needed. Nothing can be more plain than that, at this time, Sir Robert Peel did not intend to rely on the assistance of the income-tax for more than a short period. It was to be a temporary measure; as such, its inequalities were palliated when they could not be defended. 'The Government,' said Lord Ripon, 'did not intend to entrap the country into a permanent income-tax.' For a period of three years, subject to a renewal for two or three more, it was to be endured; at the end of that time the reinvigorated financial authorities were to depose the friendly Dictator they had set up. The next two years proved the general soundness of Sir Robert's plan, and the successful conversion of the three-and-a-half per cent. stock in 1844 strengthened the financial position of the country. The next year was to witness the close of the first term of the income-tax; the three years of probation were ended; the ordinary revenue nearly equalled the ordinary expenditure; what had been expected was practically realized; and it might have been thought possible, by a financier who looked only to the present, to dispense with the extraordinary aid.

Sir Robert Peel, however, thought otherwise in 1845; an increase in the naval estimates was recommended; but other reasons for retaining the income-tax were not far behind.

In chronicling these we are able to note the change which had come over Sir Robert Peel's mind in the course of the three years since the tax was first imposed. Then it was a dreaded necessity; now it was a friendly ally. Then he stood almost in awe of the creature he was moulding; now he was proud of his successful child. Imperfections there were doubtless in the lovely creature; but he had grown

'To her faults a little blind,
To her virtues very kind.'

A bright vision passed before his mind—a future when lowered taxation should allow free play to every effort of the manufacturer; when cheapness of living, unaccompanied (in consequence of the fresh impetus given to industry) by low wages, should brighten the poorest home in the land. The duties on cotton-wool, and on glass were to terminate; all

export duties, including those on coal, were also removed; while an immediate increase in the comfort of the people was caused by a remission of the sugar-duties, amounting to £1,300,000. Again, Lord John Russell opposed the income-tax with all his weight; again he urged its inequality, its vexatious character, and the many objections against the measure; though we find him admitting he might even have supported it, had it formed the basis of a system opposed to monopoly and commercial restriction. Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Goulburn met these arguments with the plea, that the tax was only temporary—the best answer, but yet one which could not have much weight, considering that the possibility of a further renewal had been at least hinted at. Again the tax was voted; again the revenue prospered, and the excise and customs nearly recovered the remissions made from them. Who could wonder if, in 1846, further reductions in duties were proposed,—but this time of a bolder character? The duties on timber and tallow were reduced, and the protective duties on cotton, woollen, linen, and silk manufactures, with many others of a similar character diminished; while the duties on meat and on live animals were abolished, and a sliding scale of corn-duties proposed, to terminate in three years, with a duty of one shilling a quarter.

Of all the budgets brought forward by Sir Robert Peel, this perhaps is the one most distinctly stamped with all the marked features of his policy.

By its working, manufactures were encouraged by the reduction or remission of duties on raw materials, production assisted by lowering duties on food, commerce generally stimulated by a lowering of protective duties.

The measure itself was introduced in the House of Commons, with a speech of great interest, by Mr. Goulburn; who, as if urged by some foreboding feeling that it would be the last time when he should address that assembly as Chancellor of the Exchequer to that Ministry, gave an admirable summary of the financial results of the five years of their administration.

As we look over the long list of achievements—the balance in hand of five millions, the average amount of deficiency bills diminished by four millions, the capital of the National Debt diminished by seven millions, the annual charge by one million and a half, with a prospect of a further reduction of £600,000 in a few years' time,—and all this done, 'Not only without adding to the burdens of the people, but concurrently with a great diminution of them; for that, while new taxes to the amount of £5,624,000 a year had been imposed, taxes to the amount of £8,206,000 had been remitted,' we may well feel,

that had Sir Robert Peel done no more than this, he would have deserved a high place as a financier in the grateful remembrance of his country.

A few weeks more, and all this glory was in the dust. The Government, defeated on the Irish Life Protection Bill, left office; and Lord John Russell's Administration took their places, and, in the main, carried on their measures. The next year was marked by a commercial panic and the Irish Famine, which necessitated a loan of eight millions.

1848, the year when the Income Tax expired for the second time, opened gloomily indeed. Doubt and distress seemed to fill the atmosphere. The effects of the commercial panic were still bitterly felt in England; Ireland was still prostrate; the West Indian Islands sent over a cry of trouble, while a fear of the possibility of an invasion added to the general feeling of instability. The Budget announced a deficiency, partly caused by a falling-off in the Revenue, partly by increased expenditure enhanced by the invasion panic; and the times, though rendering any increased burdens difficult, caused any remission of taxation to be even more doubtful. Lord John Russell found himself obliged to provide for a deficit of £3,346,000. To do this he proposed to re-enact the Income Tax Act, but with this change—it was to be in force for five years; the first two at one shilling in the pound, instead of sevenpence. This being very unpopular, and opposed by Joseph Hume, although unsuccessfully, the Government did not press the first part of the measure, but only sought for a renewal for three years at the old rate. A diminution in the expenditure was likewise found practicable;—the revenue turned out not quite so bad as was expected, and the deficiency was provided for by issuing exchequer-bills and the sale of stock.

The military estimates for this year amounted, including the charge for the Kaffir War, to £18,745,000; while in 1842, even with the expense of the Chinese Expedition, they had only risen to £16,115,000, and in 1835 to no more than £11,657,000. This great and—what was worse—progressive increase, attracted considerable attention; and the financial campaign of 1849 opened with a motion of Mr. Cobden's for reducing the expenditure by ten millions. This rough-and-ready plan was rejected; but the hint was not lost on the Government, and a reduction of two millions and a quarter was actually made; a diminution which, though far from what Mr. Cobden had desired, probably was not far from equalling the economical anticipations of the financial reformer.

A considerable surplus, larger than had been calculated on, agreeably surprised the Government; who, in the following

year, proposed to retain a portion of this to strengthen their balance-in-hand, and to employ the remainder in reducing stamp-duties and abolishing the excise on bricks. Loans for improving land were likewise to be made out of the augmented balances in the Exchequer; the repayments of which appear, as they have accrued, not to have been in all cases, as they should have been, applied to reducing debt, but to meet the current expenditure of subsequent years. The reduction in the stamp-duties was, however, not considered sufficiently advantageous to the landed interest, in whose favour the alteration had been proposed, and a further diminution of the scale was wrested from the weakness of the Government.

The financial prospects of 1851 were not very brilliant, and the Ministry far from powerful. The Income Tax again expired, and there was no doubt of a considerable amount of reluctance in the House of Commons to its re-imposition. Sir Charles Wood, in bringing forward the first of the two Budgets which he was fated to propose that year, gave an interesting analysis of the incidence of taxation, by which it appeared that, speaking generally, and including Local Rates, a revenue of twenty-five millions and a half was imposed on property, while the amount of other taxation was forty-five millions and a half. Hence the Chancellor of the Exchequer argued that relief was due rather to consumers than to owners of property, and proposed a reduction of the duties on coffee, on foreign timber, and on agricultural seeds, in addition to the fall which was to take place this year in the sugar-duties;—he also intended to abolish the window-duties, and to impose instead a house-tax, less in proportion. A proposal to relieve local rate-payers, by dividing the charge of pauper-lunatics between them and the Consolidated Fund, was included in this scheme, the most substantial part of which was a renewal of the income-tax for three years. The whole, compared with those Budgets of former years which we have been considering, bears the impress of weakness, of an endeavour for ineffectual conciliation of political opponents, of palliatives rather than actual remedies. A ministerial crisis followed, which, though partly owing to other causes, Sir Stafford Northcote is doubtless justified in ascribing in some measure to dissatisfaction at the Budget. The Government ultimately, owing to Lord Stanley's inability to form an Administration, resumed their functions. A vehement opposition to the Income Tax ensued. The Conservatives objected to it altogether as a permanent tax; the Radicals desired its continuance, but objected to the manner in which it was assessed, and desired to see it fall more heavily on property.

As, however, these two opposed hosts of enemies could not be

induced to combine, the tax itself survived; though Joseph Hume was enabled to inflict on the Government a defeat, by his motion that it should be imposed for one year only, and not for three as they desired. The house-tax also was remodelled, and arranged to afford exemption to the lower class of houses. The debates on this tax gave Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Gladstone both an opportunity of expressing their opinions on the Income Tax, and both stated their objections to it in its present form.

It is interesting to note this record of opinions from men of such opposite character, together with the fact that both of them have had subsequently to renew this obnoxious impost. The following year saw Lord Derby in power, but no great alterations in the financial system of the country followed; more were proposed in Mr. Disraeli's abortive Budget of December in that year, the most commendable feature of which was the enlargement of the house-tax as a substitute for other taxation. An alteration in the income-tax, to be brought down to incomes of £50 a year, was also part of the scheme—a plan to which, theoretically, there can be no objection, if the tax is to form part of the permanent financial system of the country; especially if connected with what undoubtedly would be one of the fairest methods of mitigating its hardships, if an immunity from taxation were granted (as proposed by Bentham) to a fixed minimum of income, sufficient to provide the necessities of life.

Lord Derby having retired, Lord Aberdeen's Administration was formed, with Mr. Gladstone as Chancellor of the Exchequer. The revenue had exceeded, the expenditure had been less than, Mr. Disraeli's anticipations; nevertheless, a re-imposition of the income-tax was found necessary. Sir Stafford Northcote bears a favourable testimony to the great ability with which the measure was introduced by Mr. Gladstone; throughout, indeed, the work of a master-hand is visible. Two inducements to accept the measure were offered: the first, that it should, after passing from the primary charge of 7*d.* through two diminishing stages of 6*d.* and 5*d.*, cease finally in 1860; the second, that it should be accompanied by some extensive remissions of indirect taxation; yet we cannot doubt that the most powerful argument in its favour lay in the fact that the tax was practically unavoidable. And, doubtless, the greater part of Mr. Gladstone's audience practically coincided with him in his feeling that the income-tax was attended with many inequalities and many inconveniences—that, though a powerful reserve in time of war, and an instrument of commercial reform in time of peace, it was not a tax well fitted to be a portion of our ordinary financial system. Meanwhile, a great reduction was to be made in the tea-duties; a large number of other

customs-duties were to be dealt with ; on a hundred and twenty-three articles they were to be entirely remitted, on a hundred and thirty-three reduced ; protective and discriminating duties were to be abandoned to a great extent, and rated duties, as far as possible, to be substituted for duties *ad valorem*. The excise on soap also was struck off the list of taxes, and various remissions made.

The most remarkable feature of this Budget, however, was the new Succession Duty.

'The object was to provide that a tax should be laid upon all successions to property taking place in consequence of death. Hitherto, the legacy duty had been applicable only to personal property descending either by bequest or inheritance. Personal property passing under the trusts of a settlement, and real property, whether passing by settlement, inheritance, or devise, had been exempt from duty. This state of things, said Mr. Gladstone, was too anomalous to be permanent. There might be reasons for exempting real property from taxes imposed upon other kinds of property ; for it was admitted, or at all events it was argued, that real property bore an undue proportion of local taxation, and was more heavily rated to the income-tax than personalty, besides having to pay much more in the form of stamp-duties on the occasion of its transfer ; but there could be no such reason for exempting personal property passing under settlement from a charge to which the like property passing in another manner was subject ; and, even as regarded real property, he pointed out that the reason assigned for the exemption was wider than the exemption itself ; and that if it were on account of its peculiar burdens that freehold property was to be allowed to escape, leasehold and copyhold property would have an equal claim to indulgence, which, however, they did not enjoy. He proposed, therefore, to abolish the existing distinctions, and to charge the succession duty upon successions of all kinds.'

The claims of certain kinds of property to consideration on account of peculiar burdens imposed on them, and the amount of interest which the heir took in his inheritance, were also considered, and allowed for by various provisions.

Hitherto, the amount of revenue realized has not equalled Mr. Gladstone's expectations, but there can be no doubt of the justice of the principle of the measure ; and as long as it remains on the statute-book, it will be a valuable source of supply to the British Exchequer.

This Budget is in many ways remarkable. It is the first, since that of 1845, which can be considered as carrying out the principles of Sir Robert Peel's policy ; and yet there is a marked difference between the disciple and his master,—not always in favour of the former.

We miss, as Sir Stafford Northcote truly says, the caution which marked in so striking a manner the financial plans of Sir Robert Peel ; on the other hand, we meet with a boldness of conception truly Mr. Gladstone's own. A more prudent man would probably have abstained, after the experience of past

years, from holding out an expectation that the income-tax should cease after 1860; but, on the other hand, a more prudent man, who refrained from giving some such promise, would hardly have succeeded in reimposing that unpopular tax. A more cautious man might have read the signs of the times better; but a more cautious man would, doubtless, have hesitated before proposing those measures of reform in the commercial tariff, which assisted in infusing into the national finance that vigour which carried it buoyantly through the stormy days that followed.

We must not, also, leave unnoticed another portion of the financial scheme of the next year—Mr. Gladstone's endeavour to lower the interest on a portion of Consols. No minister hitherto has been found bold enough to grapple with the difficulties of such an attempt. In this case it failed; but the causes of the failure do not appear to be due to any want of judgment in the measures proposed, but rather to the disturbances in the money-market which took place before the changes could be carried into effect. The plan was very favourably received at the time, and would probably have succeeded had it been introduced under more auspicious skies: for, in 1853, the happy days of peace were rapidly drawing to a close.

Connected with this part of the subject, Sir Stafford Northcote makes a few remarks on those who expected that the discoveries of gold in Australia and California would produce a revolution in the rate of interest:—

'There were, indeed, those who thought that the large discoveries of gold would reduce its value as a medium for the purchase of commodities. It is certainly possible that they may have this effect. Perhaps they have already to some extent, produced it. But there seems no reason for concluding that an alteration in the relative value of gold and of other commodities would lead to a reduction in the rate of interest, or to a rise of the Funds.'

In writing this, Sir Stafford Northcote appears to have lost sight of the fact, that though the interest payable on the Funds may be maintained at the present rate, yet the relation which that interest bears to the actual income of the country may be widely altered. Should what we may, for convenience, term the purchasing power of money fluctuate in course of time very much from the present ratio; should the time ever come (to put it broadly) when in England a labourer, who is now paid half-a-crown, may receive a sovereign as wages for the same work, and yet only be able with that sovereign to buy as much food and clothing as the half-crown now affords, and this change be owing solely to the greater cheapness of gold; then the Fundholder, and with him also all who have bargained to receive a fixed interest for their money, will find themselves exactly in

the same predicament as the present recipients of fixed incomes apportioned in the times of Queen Elizabeth.

The same nominal amount of £ *s. d.* will continue to be paid to the Fundholder, but the taxes by which that sum is raised may mean a very different proportion of the resources of the land. To the nation generally it will merely mean the reckoning with more counters; but the Fundholder, the Mortgagee, the Annuitant, may come to feel, that though what is stipulated in the bond is duly paid them, they can purchase with the proceeds fewer of the necessities of life. We should not have noticed Sir Stafford Northcote's remarks, had it not appeared to us that, though verbally correct, he was practically in error on the subject. The change will probably come on so gradually as to be almost imperceptible during progress; but it will be curious if that celebrated personage, the British Fundholder, should ever find himself, with his stipulated three golden sovereigns a year for every hundred invested, in the condition in which the Head Master of Eton would be, were he limited for his daily refectations, to the appointed eighteenpence a week, or even to the twenty-two pence allowed in time of scarcity.

The finance of the years 1854-5-6 is so interwoven with the expenses of the Crimean War, that its history scarcely connects itself with the commercial policy of the country. The year 1855 witnessed the highest revenue ever probably raised in Great Britain.

'The following remarks of Sir George Lewis, upon the ability of the country to bear this great strain, are worthy of notice, and may suggest some important considerations:—

"To enable the country to bear the increased charge, the items of which I have now submitted to the Committee, all that is necessary is that its resources should remain unimpaired, and that the vast creation of wealth which has been going on without interruption for some years past should not suffer any diminution in consequence of the vicissitudes of the war. Now, Sir, there is one cause of favourable anticipation to which, I think, hardly sufficient attention has been paid in this House, and to which, as it seems to me, scarcely sufficient credit has been given to the Government which preceded that of my noble friend near me: I mean, the measures they adopted with respect to trade with neutral nations. It is well known that, during the late war, a large portion of the disturbance of trade, and interruption to manufactures, was owing to the unwise retaliatory measures adopted by this country against the Berlin and Milan Decrees. The Orders in Council then issued led to a great disturbance of the trade with neutral nations, and created an amount of loss and disturbance of commerce and industry, which it would, perhaps, be no exaggeration to say was equal to the entire detriment and suffering created by the increased taxes. From that cause of national loss the country has been fortunately saved by the wise measures which the late Government have adopted. In consequence of the measures adopted in former years by the Legislature, as well as of the measures taken for the protection of our commerce since the war, hitherto with success, a sound state of commerce

has been preserved, and it appears that a vast increase has taken place in the amount of our foreign trade. . . . They prove that an enormous mass of wealth exists in the country, from which an additional amount of taxation can be raised to defray the extraordinary expenditure of the country."

Mr. Gladstone's efforts to raise the whole amount of revenue required for the war within the year deserve the closest attention, and, we cannot help thinking, a broader tone of criticism than that in which Sir Stafford Northcote has commented on them. It is true that, as the war went on, loans were required; but Sir Stafford Northcote might have spared the sneer in which he indulged, as to what Mr. Gladstone's language might have been had he been in office when a loan was imperatively demanded.

It is true that Mr. Gladstone failed to perform all he desired; yet, without doubt, his courageous manner of facing the difficulty at the very first, influenced the public mind greatly, and rendered the imposition of the heavy taxation actually required more easy. Scarcely half the actual cost of the war remains as a debt—a burden on the industry of the country. Would not this proportion have been greatly exceeded had not Mr. Gladstone so strenuously endeavoured to avert any addition being made to the debt at all? Great expenditure is invariably accompanied by prodigality.

Had an increase in taxation, sufficient to meet the actual cost of the war, been made at the time, would any one now be the worse for it? Would any person living in Great Britain have been actually crushed by excessive taxation? Luxuries would doubtless have been curtailed, and much inconvenience inflicted; but would not those temporary inconveniences have been more than counterbalanced by avoiding increased taxation now, to defray the interest of the increased debt? Would not greater watchfulness over expenditure have been awakened both in Parliament and in the Executive Government, and thus retrenched some of the needless expense caused by mismanagement and want of administrative ability?

But we gladly pass on to the days of peace. Sir Stafford Northcote truly says, that there is not, in the whole period he has undertaken to review, a more interesting time than the opening of the year 1857.

'The Treaty of Paris had put an end to the war with Russia in the spring of 1856, and the year following the ratification of that treaty had been, in common parlance, a year of peace; but, financially speaking, it had been just as much a year of war expenditure as either of the years before it. It is at the close therefore, and not at the commencement, of 1856 that we must consider the war to have terminated, and that we must put to ourselves the question, Stands England where she did before the struggle?

'As regards the material resources of the country, it needs but a hasty glance to see that, while serious drafts had been made upon them, they

had in no degree been impaired by the contest in which we had been engaged.

'In short, while Russia had been exhausted, and even France had felt herself seriously weakened by the drain of war, England had but just begun to put forth her strength, and was evidently in a position which would have enabled her, had it been necessary, to carry on the contest for a considerably greater length of time without distress.

'But while the war had thus passed over without making any serious impression upon the material resources of the country, the moral effect which it had produced had been enormous. It had awakened that combative spirit which lies deep in the English character, and which is something distinct from the love of glory or the thirst for conquest which we notice in other warlike nations. It had rudely dispelled the dream of perpetual peace and uninterrupted tranquillity in which the nation had for some time been lapped. It had exposed the defects which our military system had, by long disuse, contracted, and it had not lasted for a sufficient time to enable us to show how much we had done towards supplying those defects, and making our army what it ought to be; so that we left off with an uneasy and dissatisfied feeling with respect to the state of our military power. It had compelled us, too, to spend our money freely, and almost recklessly, and had thus begotten in us a habit and even a taste for expenditure, such as it is much easier to acquire than to get rid of. The ease with which we had borne our burdens had, of course, greatly contributed to encourage this tendency to expense, and to make men listen impatiently to the cautious warnings of the economist. Yet, with all this, there was in the public mind a strong and very general desire, I should rather say a firm determination, to get rid of the burden of the war-taxes.'

At the very opening of the Session, it became evident that a serious struggle against the war-taxes would take place. Lord Derby, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Gladstone, and Lord John Russell all joined in calling on the Government to reduce the estimates to the level of a peace establishment. This concurrence of opinion among three of the most eminent independent members of the House of Commons, who generally differ widely from each other on many questions of policy, marks their strong feeling of the necessity for economy. Yet we cannot but regret the result of the effect produced by this strong opposition to Government, though that result cannot be wondered at.

In the unsettled state of affairs, with heavy charges for Persian and Chinese wars oppressing the Treasury, with signs of disturbance both on the Continent and in America, a reduction of military and naval expenditure was scarcely possible. The easier outlay to avoid was, as every one knows from his own experience, the reduction of the debt. Thus the worst possible course was followed,—the expenditure was not diminished, the taxation was not increased; but the only course by which the burdens of the country can be lightened in future times was not followed,—the instalment of debt, which Parliament had solemnly bound itself to pay off, was allowed to remain untouched.

A commercial crisis—one of the severest ever experienced by the country—took place in the autumn of 1857. Early in the spring of the following year, Lord Palmerston's Government was broken up by the defeat on the Conspiracy Bill. Lord Derby's Administration did not, however, find the task of reducing the estimates easier than their predecessors, and again the attempt to diminish the debt was abandoned. Nevertheless, the revenue exceeded anticipation, and in the spring of the following year, Mr. Disraeli found the balance in the Exchequer sufficiently strong to enable him to pay off two millions of exchequer-bonds which then became due.

Heavy as the expenditure of this year was, had it been possible to prevent that of subsequent years from exceeding it, the falling-in of the Long Annuities, in 1860, would have enabled the Government to take off the income-tax in 1861, incredible as that may seem now. The state of foreign affairs, however, rendered increased military and naval outlay necessary; and in the next year, 1859, Mr. Gladstone was compelled to raise the income-tax. The expenditure exceeded his anticipation, but the surplus on the year amounted to more than a million and a half.

This sketch of the financial policy of recent years having been brought as far as 1860, Sir Stafford Northcote observes:—

‘I find it so difficult, and even impossible, to enter at any length upon a discussion of the Budgets of 1860 and 1861, that I shall not make the attempt. I have endeavoured to criticise the policy of the years I have been describing fairly and impartially. If I were to go on with the history of the two years, in the struggles of which I have myself had occasion to take part, I should try to avoid all conscious unfairness; but I could hardly hope to write without a greater amount of bias than I should like to show.’

The Budget of 1860-1 will be memorable for having formed part of the scheme which included the French Treaty of Commerce. The consequent alterations of customs-duties involved a remission of about £1,700,000; besides which, Mr. Gladstone proposed to repeal other duties to the extent of a million, and the paper-duty. These remissions were, in round figures, about the equivalent of the Long Annuities which fell in at this date. The year consequently, instead of witnessing the promised termination of the income-tax, saw it fixed at tenpence in the pound. The rejection of the repeal of the paper-duty by the House of Lords is now a matter of history. Notwithstanding the retention of this source of revenue, there was a considerable deficit on the year—a deficit which was again increased in 1862.

‘It is natural, at the close of such an inquiry as that which I have now completed, to turn back and ask: What has been the general result, in a

financial sense, of the whole policy which I have been reviewing? Does the country stand better, or stand worse, in 1862 than in 1842? How do its accounts appear when we come to make them up?

'In endeavouring to contribute some suggestions towards an answer to this question, I must guard myself by once more referring to the narrow point of view from which I am about to look at it. The great fiscal and commercial measures of the last twenty years have wrought a wonderful change in the circumstances of the country. A complete revolution has taken place in many parts of our moral, social, and political system, which may be directly traced, either wholly or in great part, to the effects of those measures. Our material wealth, too, has enormously increased; our trade has developed; and our manufactures have been carried to great perfection. There have been seasons of temporary, local, and partial suffering, and the changes which have proved beneficial to the public have sometimes hardly pressed upon particular interests; but, upon the whole, it can hardly be questioned that the condition of every portion of the community has been greatly improved by the new policy.

'But these are matters of which I have not undertaken to treat, and I leave them on one side while I look at the mere financial question which I have already put. I am by no means sure that the answer to this question is as clear as many persons are inclined to think it. Of course, in a general way, it may be said that a country whose wealth has increased is better able to bear heavy financial burdens than it was before such increase. England therefore, being richer in 1862 than she was in 1842, is, in a certain sense, better able to bear such burdens now than she was then. But it must not be forgotten, in the first place, that she is not only able to bear increased taxation, but is actually called on to bear it. If her wealth has increased, so has her expenditure; and that, too, in a pretty equal degree. Mr. Gladstone, in his budget-speech of 1860, pointed out that between 1842 and 1859 the wealth of the country had increased about 28½ per cent., and the expenditure in the same time about 27 per cent.'

The question naturally arises, Has the increase in our national expenditure been the cause or consequence of the fiscal policy of recent years? Neither assertion would be true without considerable qualification.

'Our fiscal policy has, perhaps, not directly caused us to spend more, but it has certainly encouraged us to do so. Many causes have been at work to lead to increased expenditure; and so have many causes been at work to lead to increased prosperity. We assign to the fiscal and commercial policy of late years a very large share of credit for the prosperity, perhaps we do not sufficiently recognise its influence on the expenditure. The long peace, the progress of science, and its application to all the arts of life, the development of the railway system, the improvements in agriculture and manufactures, the discoveries of gold, the impulse given to colonization, are the causes which have most manifestly led to our prosperity. Their effect has, undoubtedly, been much enhanced by the removal of restrictions which would otherwise have retarded the march of improvement; and the improvement may therefore, in a sense, be said to be due to that removal. But somewhat similar reasoning is applicable to the case of our expenditure. If we had not so ready an engine as the income-tax at our hand, we should have found it impossible to do all that we have done in the way of spending. We could not have met the demands that have been made upon us for the education of our people, for the improvement of our judicial system, for the comfort or even the efficiency of our army and navy, and for hundreds of other objects of more or

less importance, if our fiscal system had continued as inelastic as it appeared to be in 1840. When, in order to meet any additional expenditure it was necessary to impose a new tax, the power of increasing our expenditure was greatly restricted. Now that additional expenditure can be met by the simple expedient of slightly adding to the rate of an existing tax, that restriction is nearly done away; and as the removal of the restrictions on commerce has promoted commerce, so the removal of the restrictions on expenditure has promoted expenditure.'

Sir Stafford Northcote considers that a broad distinction must be drawn between the expenditure of the years preceding and those subsequent to the Russian War, which 'not only rendered large expenditure necessary, but infected the whole nation, and not this nation only, but all Europe also, with ideas of extravagance.'

We should be inclined to demur to the complete truth of this statement. The expenditure has been required, not so much from habits of prodigality engendered by that war, but by the generally unsettled state of affairs in foreign countries which has unfortunately prevailed since that period. That contest was certainly confined to the most distant regions of Europe, but it is impossible to overrate the influence of the fact that European nations had been once more drawn up in hostile array against each other. It showed that all the close-knit bonds of peace might be snapped by a calculating policy; it showed, in the teeth of reiterated assertions to the contrary, that war was still unhappily possible; and we are reaping the bitter results of that inevitable struggle.

On looking back over this volume, we are far from objecting to the narrow scope of view to which the author has restricted himself. It is little more than a chronicle of taxes imposed and repealed that he sets before us; and much of what he relates is probably but languidly remembered by many, as the period is too recent to have been yet enshrined in the appointed niches of regular history. But while we admit that any attempt to review the financial policy of the last twenty years, which attempted more—which endeavoured to portray the effects produced by that policy on the people of Great Britain, must inevitably have been swelled to such dimensions as to require many stout volumes, instead of the thin octavo now before us, we must entirely demur to the merits of the policy in question being judged by mere financial tables. Sir Stafford Northcote himself, we are sure, would be the first to admit this, and to feel that the change in the financial policy of the country, great as that has been, has been far more than equalled by the change for the better in the general condition of the people. The man who saw in ill-built, ill-lighted, ill-ventilated English houses the monuments of Pitt's taxation, saw but a fractional part of what might have been manifest to

his eyes had he been able to trace out the results of taxation in all the innumerable furrows which it scours out, by long passage, in the condition of those who endure it. That the continual dropping wears the stone, is not more true than that taxation, ill-arranged and long-abiding, wears and frets the industry of a people, moulding it at length to employments which are frequently far from the most suitable to their powers, or the most remunerative.

Viewed in this light, we may claim for Sir Robert Peel's and, in its measure, for Mr. Gladstone's system of taxation, the merit—and it is no slight one—of leaving the nation as much unrestricted as possible, in the development of its industry, by the heavy weight which past times and present needs render inevitable. When we compare the number of trades now liable to visits from 'the officers of the Inland Revenue' with those who used to be open to those of the 'Excisemen' at the beginning of the century, we can see at a glance how great has been the gain in this direction. Add to this the enormous impetus given to industry by cheaper food and cheapened materials, and we have the causes of a growth of power, great indeed, but, we may hope, yet capable of very considerable extension.

The very interesting tables at the close of Sir Stafford Northcote's volume show the progress as well as the incidence of taxation within the time which he was treated; and they record some facts, which perhaps might otherwise have been forgotten such, for instance, as that, in the years 1859-61, the revenue raised was only about a million and a half less than in 1856-7, the last and heaviest of Crimean-war expenditure: the next following year saw some remission, and the present time some more. Yet, including the outlay on fortifications, the expenditure of the present year is within a very few thousands of the sum raised by taxation in the year 1856-7, the highest that England has ever known.

The question naturally arises, Can this state of things last? Are we to go on continually with an Income Tax as regular an item in the Budget as the Customs? If we are not, where is the remedy to be found? The customs-duties, except under the pressure of some overwhelming necessity, scarcely admit of much enhancement. The excise, on such commodities as are still subject to it, would hardly bear to be raised; and few would recommend subjecting fresh or lately emancipated manufactures to its restriction.

The Minister who will untie, or cut, this Gordian knot, will be, we venture to think, the man who, after carefully revising the military and naval expenditure, will dare to reverse some of the policy of recent years, and, instead of relieving local tax-

payers at the expense of the Consolidated Fund, will throw more of what are really local charges on the local ratepayer.

The whole expenses of education, which have such a marked tendency to expansion, those of prisons, police, &c., are surely rather local than state charges. These charges would necessarily have to be combined with a comprehensive measure on the Poor Law, enlarging the area on which the rates are to be levied, from the parish to at least the district or the county, and embodying measures to provide for the diminution of the pauper-class, by educating, in all cases, the children who have to be maintained, in industrial schools at a distance from the lowering influences of the workhouse.

The rate-in-aid which parishes in Lancashire and Cheshire are now, in certain circumstances, entitled, under Mr. Villiers' Act, to charge to their neighbours, is a partial working-out of this idea. Sooner or later, some plan of this nature will surely follow the relaxation of the strict laws of settlement which have taken place of late years. To the poor themselves the gain will be great; 'close' parishes will become unknown, and all the shifts and evasions by which one parish is benefited at the expense of those surrounding it will be at an end. The immediate outcry might arise, 'that the preventive check will be taken off;' but it would be possible to guard against this by levying an extra local rate on the parishes or unions in which the charges exceeded a given ratio to the population. Also the including within the limits of taxation those places which now dishonestly contrive to evade their due share of the burden, would give considerable relief to the rest. Another source of relief to the ratepayer would arise from the fact, that when the area on which the rate is levied is enlarged, it would be highly improbable that the whole of the population within that limit would be suffering alike from distress. Now-a-days, when a town or parish is least able to afford it—when want of work and, simultaneously, want of profit afflict the inhabitants, it is taxed the highest. Then, when one place was suffering, it would be assisted by more flourishing neighbours, on whose prosperous backs the burden would scarcely be felt.

Under such a system, the present terrible distress in the Cotton Districts would be assisted, as is due, by the country at large—not by the hazardous interposition of State assistance, but by the free working of the natural organization.

Is it a vain vision to hope that, by some readjustment of this sort, coupled with an enlarged house-tax, it might be possible to free ourselves from the dangerous experiment of continuing the present Income Tax in days of peace?—leaving that perilous instrument again for a time disused in the storehouse of the

State, laying it aside till greater necessities call for severer efforts ; when, we doubt not, the tax will be borne as patiently and heroically as it has been to the present time.

The statesman who will redeem the now forfeited pledge of the remission of the Income Tax may look for a high place in the honour of his country. To do so will be no easy task, and, to render his work enduring, he must join wise expenditure with judicious economy ; he must work out with it that most difficult problem, Retrenchment, without diminution of usefulness.

To all who are interested in such endeavours, Sir Stafford Northcote's volume, especially the clear tables at the close, will be a useful help. Popular, from the nature of the subject, it can never be, but it will be well that it should be a carefully-read book.

ART. V.—*A History of the Romans under the Empire.* By CHARLES MERIVALE, B.D. late Fellow of S. John's College, Cambridge. Vol. VII. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green. 1862.

It is a stately portrait gallery to which Mr. Merivale introduces us in his seventh and concluding volume. All the figures are august and royal, with the exception of the one which commences this new epoch of the Roman empire. The only perplexity which the very congruity of the mighty sovereigns thus presented to our gaze with the mighty destinies it was their lot to sway produces in us, arises from the existence, we are told, of a terrible spirit of decay which underlay the whole period of these seemingly great intellects' autocracy.

The sway of the Flavian House, Mr. Merivale thinks, broke the spell which the surpassing genius of Julius had cast over the Roman people. These princes rose simply on a military revolution. Their rivals certainly were in no appreciably greater degree the elect of the city than themselves; but Vitellius had been the master of Rome, and so his conqueror was, in appearance, originally the enemy of the capital and Senate. Yet the Sabine veteran—a true plebeian farmer, a short, stout, shrewd-looking rustic, as uncouth and as fond of sharp homely witticisms as President Abraham Lincoln—used the power, which the sword had bestowed, not only moderately, but with the semblance of moderation. The Senate, by this time, after experiencing the sway of a Caligula and a Nero, not to speak of a Vitellius, knew well enough that their tribune and *princeps Senatûs*, their occasional consul, and still rarer censor, was something more than one of themselves; that the lord of the legions and master of the Roman world was master also of Rome. But they loved not to have this thing bruited abroad through the provinces; they did not like even to confess it to themselves. They felt it to be a necessity that the control of that vast dominion, menaced on all sides by hungry tribes or ambitious despots, and defended by warriors who might, at any moment, descend greedily to the easier spoil of their wealthy paymasters, should be in the hands of one man. But it was a matter of the most direct private interest with them, that their head and sovereign should treat them as his electors rather than as his courtiers; the riches and flatteries of Rome's subject territories were abundant enough to satisfy a horde of claimants—senators

as well as emperor; but, without a rigid maintenance of the forms of respect and even exaggerated deference, the provincials would, in the face of a degradation otherwise sufficiently manifest, have ceased to see in a travelling senator, or a proconsular governor, one of their sovereigns, rather than a man equally with themselves the subject and servant of the mighty monarch of the Palatine.

In this point, both Vespasian and Titus, with the princes who followed Domitian, gratified fully the cravings of their nobles. Partly, this was from the fact of their being themselves under the dominion of that same superstition, of which the senators took advantage in the case of the subject populations. But, independently of this, such a policy was almost a matter of necessity. The whole empire had grown up, like a coral reef, layer on layer, each additional accretion owing all its firmness, even all its substance, to the one source of life, the throbs of that mighty heart, which, while it absorbed into itself all native energy and self-dependence, communicated to the dead mass no fresh blood from itself to animate those shrunken veins, but only a sort of galvanic semblance of life—motion rather than breathing. A ruler, whatever the actual origin of his own supremacy, might well fear that any attempt to change the relations of things—even the appearance of ignoring the municipal theory of imperial government—would cause strange confusion, perhaps make the whole mechanically moving mass stand still. Besides having been himself brought up in the belief that the old republican idea and forms of government were the only true ones, he had, at all events, nothing else of which to avail himself, unless he betook himself to the weary task of creating a new idea, a far harder work than crushing a multitude of rivals.

The nobles—at least, the practical politicians among them—the aspirants to office—gratefully accepted the self-made soldier, in whose election to the principedom they had had no part, in return for the readiness with which he had at once recognised their theoretical independence. They sneered at his avarice; but as this, which they called by that name, was the only resource which, in the supposed necessity for keeping an unruly set of idlers quiet by ‘*panis et circenses*,’ Roman political economists could discover, in place of Nero’s readier machinery of confiscations, wealthy capitalists satisfied by a simple sneer their spite at being defrauded of imperial hospitality. They might imagine they even saw (and Mr. Merivale agrees with them somewhat unreasonably), in his wise and philanthropic schemes of national education, an astute plan for stealing the direction of the minds of the next generation; but they contented themselves with

calumniating secretly his motives, and willingly took office under him to carry out his measures.

This, however, was not the case with the whole class. The men of theory still refused 'to descend from the heights of their 'impracticable dogmatism and acknowledge the sovereignty of a 'mild autocrat.' To such men the captain of the armies of Rome showed his strength; he could well afford to give the senators flattering phrases, when, on the suspicion of hostility to his government, and not for any overt act, unless words and mutterings were such, he was able to destroy at once one of themselves. Mr. Merivale, while disavowing any feeling of enthusiasm for the plebeian parvenu—the head, as he styles him, of 'the Flavian firm'—professes great respect for his character and acts. He can see no harm in the arbitrary banishment of all the cynics and stoics, whom he somewhat vaguely stigmatizes as having been 'warmed' (a strange sort of fostering, if having its natural issue in such a persecution) 'by the indulgence of a milder system (than Nero's) till they hissed and stung.' Some credit is even assumed, on behalf of Vespasian, in that Helvidius was the only martyr whom the philosophers could claim; and yet Helvidius's only proved crime seems to have been suspected disaffection to the new dynasty. Had the Stuarts succeeded in establishing their improvements on the British constitution, we can imagine some historian of the present day appealing on these principles, in proof of the remarkable forbearance of the masters of Scroggs and Jefferies, to the circumstance of Russell and Sidney having been the only statesmen who suffered merely for suspected opinions.

Titus succeeded to supreme authority under better auspices than his father. He had in his favour the prestige of victory, and yet less of the status of a parvenu. During a short period he had been in ill odour with the aristocracy for his harshness as censor, an austerity supposed to come with a bad grace from one who, we are assured, had been shunned, before Vespasian's triumph, as a dissolute youth of foreign tastes. But, as sovereign, he learnt well to conciliate both the commonalty and the nobles, and, on his premature death, the citizens affirmed with one voice, that 'he had committed no crime, and discharged every duty.' Titus is indeed become with the modern world one of those from whose character, as we choose to present it to our fancy, are eliminated all the accidents, as it were, of antiquity and of paganism, till we are accustomed to see in him almost an ideal made up of kindness, patriotism, and philosophy. The nobles, his contemporaries, had been pleased and surprised to find in the heir of the Sabine farmer, of the man famed for uncouth jests and stern will, a polished and magnificent gentleman. The next

generation of leaders of Roman opinion exalted him by way of foil to his hated brother. Christian writers were predisposed to discover in the overthrower of their fiercest persecutors, the Jews, almost a liberator, and in the fulfiller of prophecy one favoured of heaven. Men of modern times have gladly welcomed the deviation in him from the repulsive Roman hardness and severity. Thus, all classes, who have had in their hands the formation of public opinion on the personages of history, have combined, from very different reasons, to make a household name of Titus, and associate him with Antoninus and Aurelius. But Mr. Merivale refuses, and so far rightly, to be swayed by the notoriety of a name; he seems to us even to have some pleasure in discovering a new view of an old-established character. The reign of Titus is passed over in his pages very cursorily; but the meagreness of the details at the historian's disposal may be a sufficient apology for this. Stress, too, is laid upon the effeminacy of his frequent complaints at the prematureness of his anticipated decease, and, on the ground in some measure of this, his death is spoken of as 'the disappearance from the stage' of life of a weak, though *perhaps* a pleasing unit in the great 'sum.' Even as against this charge of effeminacy we have scarcely materials on which to found a refutation, although the spirit of that famous campaign in Judea, the allowed strictness of his censorial régime, and the necessary hopelessness with which a Roman of that date was taught to look upon death, may well be pleaded on the other side as enough to counterbalance the weak data on which Mr. Merivale disputes the justice of contemporary praises. But we must very vehemently protest against the fairness of a hypothesis such as, that, 'had Titus lived to exhaust 'the treasury—and his brief career was wantonly improvident—he would have soon found his throne shaken, and been driven to 'acts of repression and tyranny, which would have blackened his 'fame with posterity.' We cannot even express much contentment at the somewhat equivocal moderation with which it is allowed, that it would be harsh on a mere guess (*a mere guess, indeed!*) at probabilities, to compare him to Nero.

In the case of Domitian, on the other hand, our historian would seem ill satisfied with the popular tradition of hate and abhorrence. The emphasis which he lays on all favourable interpretations of this prince's acts is so steady and continuous, that it is hard to understand his occasional retrogression to the old boyish instincts (not perhaps quite congenital instincts, but dating from the study of Goldsmith) of Domitian as a tyrant of the regular Neronian stamp. But we fear that, spite of favourable constructions, the orthodox theory of this reign, supported, as it is allowed to be, by a current of testimony more uniform

than that against any other Cæsar, must still stand, and this, spite of the maxim, which, however seemingly paradoxical, we confess has weight, that 'it is the duty of the judge to lean against the weight of testimony so suspiciously harmonious.'

We are told, that Domitian was 'a purist by early breeding, and a reformer, as he afterwards proved himself, and untaminated by contact with the licentious East,' and that it was on account of his delicacy of feeling that he refused the proffered hand of his niece Julia. But for scruples which did not impede his entering into an adulterous connexion with the same woman, it is impossible to feel much respect. Besides, his Roman biographer explains the rejection of the offer much more plausibly, as due to his yet stronger affection for another man's wife, Domitia, whom he did take possession of and marry. So, even granting that the emperor may have been a disciplinarian by birth and breeding, we cannot allow that the strange inconsistency that he had in effect lost 'none of the Sabine faith in temperance and chastity by his personal indulgence in the grossest excesses,' can be any shield to the name of the crowned adulterer who dared to decree a revival of that domestic purity which he was ever violating. It may or may not be a true theory of the policy of this reign, that it was 'an epoch of administrative reaction, when an attempt was made to recall society to ancient principles and ideas;' and that, for instance, his prosecution of Vestals, who had broken their vows, was actuated not by a moral but by a religious feeling; but, even if so, that the man should consciously have used the weight of his prerogative to enforce the show, and nothing but the show, of virtue, while himself the most flagrant violator of the substance, marks his character as yet more contemptible.

Mr. Merivale considers that Domitian 'with some kindly and even generous emotions, and not wholly devoid of refined tastes, lacked the tenacity of fibre which strung the old Roman and Sabine fabric, and displayed no firm determination, no vigour and persistence in his designs.' It is to be regretted that we are furnished with not a single proof of those kindly and generous emotions; but, at all events, this apology for Domitian, on the ground of want of will and resoluteness, is opposed to the material for eulogium which our author finds in the prince's successful determination to use and not be governed by his ministers. It is said: 'When we cast an eye on the complex system of administration which embraced the vast extent of the empire, and trace all its leading threads to the Imperial Cabinet on the Palatine, and to the hand of the eager, impulsive, and luxurious child of fortune there installed, we must admit that the fact of such a machine being so firmly guided for so many

'years is itself an answer to much of the ribald scandal which connects his name with the extreme of frivolity and licentiousness.' And further: 'It was observed of Domitian by a competent critic (supposed to be Trajan), that he was well served by his ministers; and the course of our history will show conclusively that of all the Cæsars he held himself most free from their control and dictation, two facts which speak with equal force for the good sense and natural ability of a despot.' The apology for his cruelties as arising from the sensibility to fear in a delicate organization, and the praise of his government as the firm administration of a man who knew his own will and carried it out, are surely inconsistent. A Nero might excuse himself on the one score, a Vespasian might claim approval on the other, but the same man cannot use both alternatives.

We must acknowledge ourselves equally sceptical as to the sufficiency of an apology for the emperor's employment of hordes of common informers, on the plea, that 'the emperors, being, constrained to veil the extent and foundation of their power, could not come forward openly and demand protection.' The builders-up of imperial prerogative were, therefore, sycophants: nevertheless, the work itself was seasonable. It was time that 'the reality of monarchy should be stripped of its disguises, and no pretence left for a fitful assertion of an impracticable idea of liberty. The long enjoyment of good and temperate government which followed was probably, in a great degree, owing to the naked interpretation of imperial power put forth by the crown-lawyers of Domitian. But some years of mutual misunderstanding were still to be endured by prince and people before this consummation could be reached.' According to this line of argument, Domitian and Commodus must have been far greater benefactors to Rome than Vespasian and Trajan and the first two Antonines; for, if the encouragement of informers and the naked demonstration of despotic powers were essential to the happiness of their subjects, great were the errors of these last-named and, according to the vulgar belief, virtuous and benignant sovereigns! We are afraid that even the fact that, in the reign of Domitian, so many corrupt governors and bad judges were brought to justice—and this, Mr. Merivale seems to think, by the machinery of public informers—may admit of an interpretation equally unfavourable to this sovereign's fame. Why may we not apply an explanation, already adduced by our author, of this mad tyrant's baseless persecutions of the rich and noble, and ascribe even these honest-seeming prosecutions of vicious officials to the ruler's craving for confiscations to cover his expenditure on largesses to the populace?

Domitian's successor, Nerva, has hitherto enjoyed something

of the fame of Titus. The evil reputation of his predecessor, doubtless, was to his advantage; and, if we may judge from coins and statues, he possessed a form and mien to conciliate veneration. These relics of antiquity show us 'the highest ideal of a Roman 'magnate, the finished warrior and statesman of an age of varied 'training and wide practical experience. Such a figure an 'Englishman might claim with pride as the effigy of a governor- 'general of half a continent.' And, in truth, the meagre traditions of the time, so far as they convey any information, speak unanimously in the prince's favour. No cruel deed, not even an unkind one, is laid to his charge. He may have been epicurean in tastes and opinions, but from no selfishness of his did danger fall upon his dominions; and he left to his people the most precious legacy a sovereign can ever bestow—a noble and valiant successor. Mr. Merivale is, as we have seen, ready to give Domitian all the benefit of the fact, that he, whatever his caprices and frivolity, did govern a gigantic empire. But, as in the case of Titus, so in that of Nerva, he directs no attention to this truth when dilating on these sovereigns' facile weakness of character. So terrible a burden, even with the aid of wise ministers, is made a set-off to acts of folly and cruelty, which even 'loved to play with its victims;' surely the successful endurance of so huge a weight of care may be pleaded yet more forcibly in favour of a ruler, easy and kind-hearted, as Nerva is represented, to a fault.

We think Mr. Merivale has also rather misplaced the commencement of a new phase of Roman public opinion as regarded the personal status of the emperor. There are few, if any, phenomena of history so mysterious as the Roman habit of deifying their dead, and, by anticipation, their living sovereigns. Mr. Merivale appears to think that their subjects had actually believed in their title to divinity, and that it was only the accession of Nerva which broke the spell. 'With all his zeal,' we read under the head of Domitian, 'for the honour of the 'national divinities, the chief of the Roman people could not 'fail to remark that none of their deities was so present to their 'minds, as an object of regard and veneration, as the person 'of the prince himself, their august patron and protector. A 'feeling of mysterious awe attached to the living principle 'which seemed to animate the conduct of human affairs, from 'the centre to the circumference of the empire; and this feeling 'was easily lost in religious devotion to the visible Chief of the 'State. Domitian followed the bias of the times in sanctioning 'more openly than hitherto the outward expression of Cæsar- 'worship.' And further: 'Accordingly, the notion of Domitian's 'participation, even while yet alive, in the Divine nature, was 'instinctively admitted by the vague superstitious feelings of the

'people.' It was different, we are told, under Nerva :—' Hitherto, the idea that the primacy was due to the most excellent man in the Commonwealth, which easily led to the notion of the emperor's divine character and origin, had, except in the transient usurpations of Otho and Vitellius, been faithfully preserved. But the election of Nerva was avowedly mere matter of political convenience. The Senate, at last, was master of the situation, and it rejected pointedly the flimsy notion with which the nation had so long suffered itself to be amused. . . . They were very sure that no drop of celestial blood had ever flowed in the veins of any one of his ancestors.' One great objection to this theory of the principles on which a Julius, or an Augustus, was deified, is undoubtedly the clear title, on such a hypothesis, to celestial honours, in the opinion of the people, not merely of a Caligula or a Nero, for whom our author appears to have a certain admiration, but even of Domitian. There Mr. Merivale draws the line. But why so low? Or, if so low, why not lower still? Let alone Galba—for he gives up of his own accord Otho and Vitellius—what title to divinity, above Nerva and Trajan, did antecedents and character give to Vespasian, 'the plebeian emperor, the head of the Flavian firm'? And if absence and military honours dazzled the eyes of the Roman people (as we know they did not), and enabled them to perceive a halo round the vulgar face of that *abnormis sapiens*, the Ofella of the Palatine, how could they have blotted out their recollections of the scandalous debaucheries of the town-bred Domitian? Yet it is for Domitian, in his lifetime, that Mr. Merivale appears to believe that the nation felt a most real and awe-stricken veneration; to such a degree, indeed, that he represents the feeling as communicated from the breasts of the people, where it had sprung up, to that of its object, the prince. As we have already quoted, he is described as unable to avoid remarking, that 'none of their deities was so present to their minds as an object of regard and veneration.' Surely there could never have been a doubt, that, if the deification arose from 'the idea that the primacy was due to the most excellent man of the Commonwealth,' Nerva and Trajan had an equal title to it with Domitian, the man of a loose youth, followed without a break, by a loose and cruel maturity. But if, rather, it was the feeling of awe attached to the living principle of empire transferred to and embodied, as it were, in the empire's actual chief (a feeling, indeed, to which we allow a certain influence), then how could the choice by the Senate of Rome of the best of their members weaken this belief, while the empire was still whole and intact?

We believe that really the principle and faith, such as it was,

survived the reign of Domitian, though having been continually in process of losing its reality and vigour since the epoch when it originated—the reign of Augustus. Our hypothesis of its origin is different from the two grounds set forth by Mr. Merivale. It appears to us to have been the Roman substitute for the Divine Right of some despotic governments; for the theory of an original compact between prince and people, on which writers on Government rest the title of other monarchs to obedience; and, lastly, for the theory of the right to the crown being a piece of hereditary property, descending to the heir, as an estate may descend to a private owner. Now, the emperor assumed power under no supposed authority from a Providence which his subjects did not believe in; on the ground of no compact with his subjects, for his prerogative had no limits and he required no election; by no right of private ownership, for the empire in one sense was never hereditary. He might be consul or censor by the imaginary choice of the people; he would take his father's goods by the municipal law of Rome; but he was emperor by a higher title.

In fact, though brought into clear relief, at the period beginning with Nerva, he, through the accident common to so many emperors of his time, being without male heirs, the principle of designation to the imperial succession by the reigning prince—an act which, in the case of a man not the sovereign's son, took the form of adoption—had been always the received theory of a title to the throne. It was directly the title of Augustus, of Tiberius, Caligula, and Nero; in the case of Claudius, blood-relationship and the absence of competitors might well be held a substitute for actual nomination, while in that of Titus and of Domitian the real title to the throne was not so much the right of kindred, as an actual designation by the preceding sovereign. Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vespasian, and Nerva, had no such claim as the rest; but they, too, assumed the name of Cæsar, implying thereby that, in the absence of any one with a more clearly legitimate title, they too were to be considered as adopted to the empire by the already deified members of the Julian House.

It is in this circumstance of the sovereignty passing, as a rule, through the direct designation thereto of the successor by the reigning prince, that we discover the clue to the mystery of imperial apotheoses. The Roman constitution was still, in idea, republican; even an emperor had to be elected to its various offices. But the whole of this republican constitution had long been overridden by an undefined power, which nullified the constitution, without being provided for by it, and yet which maintained that constitution in its death-in-life. A Nero, or a

Titus, as a consul, a tribune, a censor, or even as a dictator, had certain rights and powers, and a limit in the duration of his authority clearly defined by the law of the State. But, as emperor, he was above all law, and yet was compelled by the proud conservatism of the Roman nation, and even by the prejudices of the provinces, to recognise the original Roman system as still existing. He was not strong enough, he, a Roman citizen, would seldom even wish to declare himself a despot ruling by the brute force of his legions; the Senate, even if they had sunk so low as to be willing to abnegate their theoretical self-government, had no constitutional power to create him a despot: and yet he was one. The inconsistencies of his position were attempted to be reconciled by the hypothesis of a celestial nature, now revealed in his predecessor, of a divine wisdom and infallibility, which the nation now recognised, and by which that prince had been entitled to name, for the rule and guidance of the cherished state he had at length left, a successor and a perpetual dictator. The Senate might recognise the authority of the new prince; but the authority itself, being beyond the constitution, could be granted by no constitutional assembly. The deification of the predecessor thus became itself the ratification of the successor's title. On this hypothesis many circumstances, inexplicable on the theory of the imperial apotheosis being the embodiment of the awe at that huge mass of territories appearing to be permeated throughout by one same spirit, are naturally accounted for. On this hypothesis it is nothing strange, as it would be on the other, that not the living master of the machinery, but the dead lord, was deified; for, as we take it, it was the discovery, the revelation, as it were, to the world of the last emperor's divinity, which made the manifestation of his will as to the succession to that vague, overruling control, which he had himself previously swayed, so potent and invincible. The people might occasionally choose, by a new flight of adulation, to detect in the living emperor the signs of divinity, and, as a consequence, to accept at once his nomination of a successor. But this was not the principle of the new prince's title; his subjects saw they were right only when the perfectness of the last sovereign's judgment was confirmed by his death and ascription among the gods.

In this same habit of deifying the deceased emperor, the Roman people found also an apology for that practical abeyance of their political liberty. No form of their ancient constitution had disappeared; they could veil from their own eyes their shame at the emptiness of these forms, under the pretence that he whose prerogative made them nugatory held an authority derived from one whose right to nominate a superintendent of

the complicated organism of their political system they had themselves expressly acknowledged, in consenting to his apotheosis. When, in the course of time, the most successful captain of the period seized the supremacy as the natural right of the master of the strongest army, without even the show of assuming the government in the interest of national rights, when the people no longer disguised from themselves that an imperial despotism was the normal state of things, and craved a regular and hereditary monarchy as the only refuge from a series of bloody civil wars, then the apotheosis of an emperor became a mere form without a meaning, instead of being, as formerly, a mere form indeed, but one in the very hollowness of which lurked a real and understood significance.

In Mr. Merivale's pages, with the accession of the Flavian dynasty, or, at all events, with the fall of Domitian (for he often invests the latter prince with a certain sacred and mysterious character), we seem to emerge into an entirely different era. 'The establishment of the monarchy,' we are told, 'had kindled the imagination of the Romans. Hard, selfish, prosaic, as they naturally were, they had been roused to enthusiasm by the greatness of Julius, the fortune of Augustus, the wild magnificence of Caius, the grace and accomplishments of Nero. In their fond admiration of the glorious objects thus presented to them, they had invested the men themselves with the attributes of divinity, their government with a halo of immortality. They were persuaded that the empire itself, under the rule of the celestial dynasty, was an effluence from the divine regimen or the world, and they consented to regard the freaks of caprice and madness from which, as from the disturbances or the elements, they occasionally suffered as mysterious, but necessary evils.' Regarded by this light, the imperial dignity of Nerva, the conqueror-spirit of Trajan, Hadrian's accomplishments, and the heroic magnanimity of the first two Antonines, secured them no veneration from their subjects. But why imagine a 'fond admiration' of Caligula and Nero, which is denied to have been evoked by the generosity of Titus, 'deliciæ humani generis,' the stately old age of Nerva, 'qui res olim dissociabiles miscuerit, principatum et libertatem?' We believe that much of the difference between the mystery enveloping the authority of the Claudian line, and 'the light of common day' of the subsequent series, is entirely imaginary. What residuum of real difference there is must be referred, not to the diminished, but to the more defined and substantial prerogative of the later emperors. It was not so much the fact of the monarchy in the earlier period being nearer its origin which 'had kindled the imagination of the Romans'—it was not

the personal grandeur or frantic folly of the first rulers—'glorious objects,' forsooth!—which 'had roused their fond admiration,' and made them 'invest the men themselves with the 'attributes of divinity—their government with a halo of immortality.' On the contrary, at that time, they still looked to the revivification of the republic as a possibility, and on this system of government as a mere temporary accident. It was because they viewed it as an unnatural thing—a shadow, which, however, might at any time become a substance—a power, which they were under no natural obligation to obey, but which tyrannically might avenge itself in some irregular way for an offence against it—that it has been handed down to the modern world as no glorious providence, but a horrible mystery, in what Mr. Merivale so well describes as 'the long organ-peals of the sounding declamation' of Tacitus.

We believe that the restrained rage, or calculated despair, underlying every sentence of that great historical satirist is really accountable, in a great measure, for the distinction embodied in Mr. Merivale's pages between *præ-Flavian* and *post-Flavian* periods. It is allowed that Tacitus did indeed write, under influences hostile to truth and sobriety, as a theorist, as one who would willingly mould truth to his own prejudices; who saw, in the fall of the oligarchy, the source of the future national calamity; whose works 'bear the impress of a rooted 'disregard for the rights and feelings of human nature apart 'from his own class and order;' as, lastly, a man whose wrath against a political foe overflowed at last in bitterness towards the age with which he has identified him, and the tendency of whose writings it is to confirm their readers in 'a cynical contempt for mankind and a gloomy despair of virtue.' But Mr. Merivale does not, we confess, appear to us to have taken sufficient advantage of his own insight into the suspicious origin of the great Roman historian's vehemence against the earlier princes. We think he might have been less ready, in his former volumes, on the authority of authors all members or clients of the fallen aristocracy, and capable, on his own showing, of ignoring the truth from the force of prejudices, to describe Tiberius, Caligula, and Nero, as monsters of utter profligacy and cruelty. He might, too, have cast back a glance on the banquets of Lucullus and his contemporaries of the republic, and hesitated to trust so far to the anecdotes of chroniclers, who, without ever looking back, traced, as of course, every vice of the age to the imperial policy, as to ascribe, in his present volume, to one same origin the mad luxury of the noblesse and the imperial discountenance of the then fashionable habit of suicide, that is, tracing both back to the emperor's fear that the

recklessness of personal consequences evinced in this latter custom might, in some moment of fierce patriotism, direct a dagger against themselves, and to the consequent desire of the government to dissolve in mad profligacy this mad despair. It seems to us that the generations which succeeded to the tastes of a Verres, or even a Hortensius, needed no lessons in extravagance; that the emperors were more probably the disciples than the teachers of this art; and that the contempt of life, originating, it is truly said, in 'the dislocation of the true moral sense among the Romans of the period,' arose from the same dislocation of the true moral sense which is shown in the luxury of the republic. It is inconsistent at once to derive the fashion itself from an existing want of moral sensibility, and this want itself from the imperial dislike and fear of the custom.

But, while somewhat unfair to the Julian and Claudian eras, in accepting the gloomy colouring of Tacitus's pictures as the true distribution of light and shadow round the imperial policy of that age, we believe Mr. Merivale to have been, to some extent, fascinated at the same time. The *régime* of Nerva, and even of Trajan and Hadrian, seems to strike him as tame and prosaic by the side of that period, which, though but partially portrayed in the meagre relics of Tacitus, looms everywhere in the background of the fragments left to us, and is the inspiration of his morbid fury. He involves, indeed, occasionally the reign of Domitian under the phrase 'Flavian period,' in his general censure (for it is almost this) of the age following the Claudian, on the score of dulness and want of interest. He even, strangely enough, contrasts almost unfavourably the *soberness* of the literature which Domitian fostered in the persons of Martial and Tacitus, and suffered in Juvenal, with 'the lawless force and feverish extravagance' of such writers as Lucan, and Seneca, and Persius. But, generally, the bitter references made, in the preface to Agricola's life, to Domitian's atrocities, are an *égis* rescuing, in Mr. Merivale's pages, the reign of that prince from the limbo of comparative tameness, to which the acts of Vespasian, and Titus, and Nerva, are consigned. Domitian shares in the tragic pre-eminence of Tiberius, Caius, Nero, as all alike 'really monsters of profligacy and cruelty;' in *his* behoof, the period at which the people ceased to believe in the divine nature of their emperors is postponed till the accession of Nerva, even though, so, the plebeian Vespasian has to be made celestial; and, notwithstanding the lateness of his date, he may claim to participate, by a perfectly equal title, with his fellow-victims the themes of the satires of Juvenal, in the apology, which looks like commendation, that 'the criminals they lash 'were at least no milksops in crime, no fribbles in vice. Their

'tyrants and hypocrites, their sensualists and parasites, are all cast in the strong mould of the Roman free State. They are genuine countrymen of Catiline and his desperadoes, of Piso and Verres, of Fulvia and Sempronia.'

Mr. Merivale describes well and vividly the reign of Trajan, that prince for whose delivery from Purgatory Pope Gregory the Great prayed, and, it is said, successfully. So far as the scanty details which have come down to us, when eked out by the never entirely trustworthy evidence of inscriptions, coins, and statues enable us to judge, a grand period of Roman history is nobly inaugurated by his reign. His face, 'the last of the imperial series which retained the true Roman type,' with its broad forehead, compressed lips, and stern compactness of structure, his love of the camp, but without the mere conqueror's blind instinct, even the coarseness of many of his tastes, recall the old captains of the Republic. It is truly said by Mr. Merivale, that the bluntness of his moral sense, which allowed him to keep his self-respect intact even through a drunken revel, and proceed direct from it to the serene discharge of the highest duties of sovereignty, was fortunate for the subjects he had to govern. But sufficient weight seems scarcely at all times to be given to a fact, subsequently adverted to, viz. that the gross habits of the period hindered such orgies from producing the same general degradation of feeling as in a purer and more refined age. If Trajan were truly 'the polished gentleman no less than the statesman,' as his letters show, some abatement ought to be made in the imputation to him, in the passage previously referred to, of coarseness in nature and habits, and a peculiar bluntness of the moral sensibility in such matters. His capacity and energy in business were, at all events, remarkable. In all matters of the least perplexity the high officials, such as provincial prefects, are seen to consult the Emperor; and the replies only occasionally hint that such minutiae as the choice of an architect for a Bithynian city might have been arranged on the governor's own responsibility. Well may the countenance of a man, on whom rested both the mighty destinies of the empire, and the petty cares of daily life throughout its remotest recesses, bear 'the look of painful thought, which seems to indicate a constant sense of overwhelming responsibilities honourably felt and bravely borne; yet, notwithstanding much assumed cheerfulness and self-abandonment, ever irritating the nerves and weighing upon the conscience.'

In Hadrian we behold a very different man to Trajan. Trajan was not, like Vespasian, a persecutor of philosophy. On the contrary, having no system of his own to patronise, and no theory as to national education, he paid it that half-admiring

respect of the unlettered man of genius which is indicated in his rejoinder to an eloquent harangue of the great moralist, Dion Chrysostomus, 'I admire you exceedingly, but I don't pretend to understand a word you say.' But his successor rendered to learning a much more positive tribute than the negative contribution of ignorant veneration. Athens, which, we are told by the way, had been always a dirty city, even in its golden prime, without any drainage but into the open sewer of the Ilissus, but was then 'a dirty city in decay,' was his favourite residence. 'The broad principle that all ancient doctrine was true enough 'to be taught, the charter of that, the great Grecian University,' was just the principle to gratify the *dilettante* tastes for philosophy of this emperor. Alexandria, 'the university of progress,' where truth was sought for, not merely as an instrument of education, pleased him less; for it wrote him no pathetic dirges on the loss of a favourite freedman, and ridiculed his pretensions to the name of philosopher. It is not, however, to be supposed from this morbid habit, to which Hadrian's subtle and curious intellect allured him, of prying into truths which he had no intention of letting himself believe, that he was a trifler among sovereigns. Charlemagne's attendance at Alcuin's School of the Palace, and interest in its fanciful problems, indicated no unfitness for the cares of empire; and so the Roman emperor's philosophical investigations were the sport of his leisure, and not a waste of the energies which belonged to his subjects. It cannot be denied that he brought about great results—contentment at home, except towards just the close of his life, and peace abroad; even his admirer, Mr. Merivale, has not done sufficient justice to his claims to be a great Roman legislator, as the real promulgator of an edict (under the name of Salvius Julianus), which was not merely, as Mr. Merivale supposes, the authorized interpretation of the law during one prætor's year of office, but (as the better opinion as to the sense of *perpetuum* suggests), was intended to furnish a permanent rule of construction. Nevertheless, clever and brilliant though he was, we are told that it is not easy to detect in him real essential greatness of character. We readily grant that in him, as in all the eminent men of his time (with the exception, we must insist, against Mr. Merivale, of Trajan), 'we miss that 'unity of aim and complete subordination of all the faculties 'to a ruling idea which exalt the man of talent into the man of 'genius.' How our historian, however, can have arrived at this conclusion is not so easy to perceive; for it is surely hard to deny some genius to 'the crowning product of the crowning age of Roman civilization,' to one who, 'the first of Roman 'statesmen, conceived the idea of governing the world as one 'homogeneous empire, and suddenly, but once for all, discarded

'even in theory the tradition of a Roman municipality as the master and possessor of all the soil of the provinces;' lastly, to a prince of whom it can be asserted that, as 'the first man of one age, he would probably have made himself first in any other (surely a very bold presumption,) and the rivalry of a Cicero and a Sulpicius might have elevated him to the acknowledged preeminence of Julius himself.'

It is a striking evidence of the poverty of facts upon which the historian of the Roman Empire has to base his conclusions, that we are left to vague conjecture for an explanation of the unpopularity which clouded the latter days of Hadrian. His reign had been a brilliant one, his personal qualities marked him out as a prince among men; and yet a senate which had pressed divine honours on worthless sovereigns would fain have refused them to this great monarch, even when demanded for him by his own adopted son and successor. We confess the received tradition of the jealous suspiciousness of old age having led the once self-depending emperor to the perpetration of numerous acts of cruelty would satisfy our mind as a clue to the odium which overwhelmed his fame. Both the odium and the persecution would no doubt be much exaggerated by the rhetorical imaginations of men who could persuade themselves that Hadrian put to death in cold blood his brother-in-law, Servianus, to whom he had ever shown peculiar deference, and that for plotting for the throne at the age of ninety. But, generally, there is nothing so very improbable in the circumstance of an, absolute ruler becoming soured in temper by the cares of State, and hence losing his popularity, as to necessitate a hypothesis that, like Augustus, finding it necessary to draw in his outposts, 'like Augustus, in his later years, or like Tiberius, the imitator of Augustus, he became an object of pique and discontent to the senators, and suffered in character from their unscrupulous animosity.' We think such a conjecture both in itself needless, and also based on a misconception as to the objects of senatorial ambition. A senator might greedily desire a wealthy government, but the number of rich provinces to be conferred on clever politicians bore a very remote relation to the number of warlike expeditions, or even to the number of victories and tribes reduced to tribute. A martial prince might gratify soldiers and military officers; but this would be a sphere of ambition now grown very alien to the taste of most of the members of those historic houses whom yet Mr. Merivale represents as admiring the Flavian Cæsars (qu. Domitian, who was equally a conqueror with Vespasian) and Trajan, as affording them opportunities for amassing wealth through war.

No such uncertainty prevails as to the affection of the nation

for Hadrian's successors, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius. If blamelessness can make a good sovereign, these two monarchs must, hand in hand, head the lists of princes. Rarely, if ever, has the world enjoyed the happiness of being swayed by two men in succession, each so utterly innocent in life and thought and action, though unlike each other in intellectual endowments. Antoninus has the superiority over his adopted son, as over all other preceding emperors, in that he was no persecutor of Christians. Trajan had magnanimously instructed Pliny, and probably other governors of provinces, to refrain from tempting believers into manifesting disobedience to the law; but this was the forbearance of habitual generosity, and without special significance, for we are informed that 'the Emperor speaks of these people as if he had never heard of them before.' We may hope that Antoninus's relaxation of the severity of pagan orthodoxy had something to do not only with his own gentleness of nature, but with a perception that the Christian maxims of life, now beginning to be understood, though faintly, were too pure and noble to endanger the safety of his people. In proof, at all events, that this absence of persecuting edicts was not only a fortunate accident of the reign, the whole tenor of his rule may be adduced, which in not a single aspect or act belied or contradicted this magnanimous policy. His private character is of the same colour as his public: as this was the very ideal of unselfishness, so that was its exact counterpart in being the very perfection of kindness, of that domestic *φιλανθρία*, when the identification of one's own interests with another's makes self-love and unselfishness convertible terms: 'At last the element of feminine tenderness, 'which underlays the rough exterior of many a Roman warrior, 'ascends the throne of the world in the person of Antonine the 'Pious.'

Antoninus was far happier than his adopted son in the circumstances of the Empire. Even at *his* accession clouds were gathering; but the impetus of Trajan's career of conquest had not, under the vigorous hand of Hadrian, as yet quite ceased to thrill through the recollection of Parthians and Dacians. Though Antoninus probably had not the genius to have initiated a bold military repression of these unquiet neighbours, he was abundantly capable of pursuing a course already pointed out. It is difficult to understand what Mr. Merivale means by speaking of 'the languid trance of the reign of Antoninus: 'his own pages contain proofs that the life-blood still flowed, and an instinct of self-preservation still was keen throughout the unwieldy mass of the empire. It was nowise owing to the forbearance of barbarian neighbours that all the aspect of affairs, civil and foreign, was so fair and serene during this reign; it was not the supineness of

the ruler, but his watchful sagacity which maintained tranquillity. It is necessary, when reading Mr. Merivale's history, to bear in mind, that the bare circumstance of the existence of contentment at home and the absence of terrible reverses on the frontiers is, by itself, almost demonstrative proof of the capacity, not simply negative, of the sovereign, whose autocratic will vibrated throughout the whole extent of the Roman world. Without this consideration ever present to the judgment, the student, after hearing much of the pure morality, or, it may be, the intellectual acuteness of a prince, may possibly find forced upon him, without notice or warning, a conclusion as to some favourite hero's character, to the effect either that in a Titus generosity did not exclude fatuity, or kindness in an Antonine the vice, for a ruler, of short-sightedness and *laissez faire*. It is really a harsh censure on the father's policy, to have the contrast of the successor's misfortunes with *his* seeming prosperity extenuated by a comparison of Antoninus's government to the treacherous serenity of the Erie of the great St. Lawrence, as though, 'when his successor received the fatal sceptre, the fitful stream was already rushing with resistless, though unruffled rapidity, to the verge of the Niagara, in which its repose and dignity were to be engulfed.' Such a comparison seems to suggest some sort of connexion between the tranquillity of the earlier administration and the troubled condition of the later, as though the former smoothness of the course of affairs was to be explained by the abyss opening in advance.

The same habit of startling the reader, by accumulating numerous reasons for admiring a ruler at first, and then summing up almost against him, is apparent in Mr. Merivale's estimate of the character and government of Aurelius. He is joined with Antoninus, as one of the only two emperors in whom is seen 'no selfish thought or passion, precipitation, pride, or pardonable vanity,' who 'governed with a single view to the good of the people.' We are told that, in his equestrian statue on the Campidoglio, 'We behold an emperor, the noblest and the 'dearest of all the line, a representative of the Scipios and 'Cæsars, a model of the heroes of Tacitus and Livy, him whom 'historians combine to honour as the worthiest of the Roman 'people.' Yet all this magnificent preamble only introduces a conclusion, to the effect, that, 'with all his devotion to duty, 'this gallant prince did not possess the vigour or the genius of a 'great commander,' and that 'his merits consisted, not so much 'in the vigour of his own acts or justness of his views as his 'choice of good ministers.' Not merely is his political capacity thus questioned; but his forbearance shown to his guilty wife, and his permitting the empire to devolve on his son Commodus,

are censured as grave crimes. No allowance is made for the circumstance that, apart from the kindness of his nature, it would have been by no means an easy, or even perhaps a possible, thing to punish the heiress of an empire, as was Faustina, or to set aside by a word her and his only son: 'He could not hide 'from himself (but instances of like want of perception have 'not been uncommon with fathers) that Commodus was vicious 'and illiterate; his weakness in leaving to his graceless offspring 'the command of a world-wide empire must reflect upon his 'memory.' Nay, more; not only his political and his private conduct are called in question; but even his philosophy is represented as somewhat weak and petty: 'His meditations seem 'to betray some want of decision, some littleness of view and 'purpose. We must smile at the fervour with which the wisest 'of princes exhorts himself to rise betimes in the morning;' and further: 'He who would exact from himself and us so high 'a standard of purity and self-renunciation, while he limits us 'so strictly to the resources of our own strength and virtue, 'discarding all the aid of a higher power, which even the 'heathen passionately demanded, should have been himself 'stronger, firmer, and more self-supporting.' Yet it does not seem to us a heavy charge against even a philosopher, that he should feel it necessary to urge upon himself attention to the little duties of life, or a reflection on the sincerity of his faith in his own doctrines, and firmness of resolution, that a philosopher become a monarch should find his advantage in reminding himself again and again of the vanity of pomp and glory. Had he yielded himself to his numerous temptations, or sought shelter from the fascinations of his position in a sort of monkish seclusion from the pleasures and, with them, the burdens of sovereignty, we might have been free to doubt the reality, or to lament the bias of his dogmas. But we see the pale student, who during the whole of his predecessor's reign, though himself the heir of the empire, 'never was tempted to quit his closet at Rome but for two nights,' at once, as sovereign, rise to the level of his duties, and become the ever-watchful general, the ever-watchful statesman. And it was no ordinary weight of cares which this emperor had to sustain, with, at home, an adulteress for his wife who even plotted his destruction, a son and heir who cared nothing for philosophy and was not famous for virtue; abroad, every frontier beleaguered by eager enemies, and, within the empire, a frightful plague, beneath which, it is calculated, half the Roman army perished. That a prince, with cares like these, should have looked back to the pursuits of philosophy with regret, and forward to death with gladness, was to be expected; that he should have kept the love of his soldiers and

citizens, without humouring their passions, through all this tempest of calamities, and, though no trained general, maintained the integrity of the empire, proves that the Greek sage was not self-deceived when he uttered the dictum (Aurelius's perpetual solace), 'that states prosper where the lovers of wisdom (*Φιλοσοφοι*, not pedants) are the sovereigns, or the sovereigns search after wisdom.'

It is a natural tendency in historians to seek for resting-places, the end of old and the commencement of new stages, in the periods they are describing. Mr. Merivale appears to us to have been beguiled by this unconscious craving into discovering in the reign of Aurelius the end of a period, as he detected the beginning of one in that of Nerva. But we doubt whether this epoch saw the catastrophe to which the historian refers. We have already expressed our disbelief that the tranquillity of the reign of the elder Antoninus was only a deceitful calm, preluding and almost implying an approaching storm. He had maintained the security of the realm bravely, as had Vespasian and Trajan; in their days as terrible misfortunes would have happened as those which oppressed Augustus through the fault of Varus, had their vigilance relaxed, or their talents for government fallen short of the occasion; and it must be attributed to Antoninus' capacity that he also preserved his dominions safe. Rome's destiny it was to be compelled to be ever on guard on pain of destruction. She had voluntarily taken on herself the sole duty of keeping under the barbarian spirit of the world, when she conquered all the civilized nations, and denied to them the right of self-defence. The peculiarity of the reign of Aurelius was, that, just at the period of his accession, one of the periodical impulses which precipitated at times hostile hordes on to the Roman frontiers happened to synchronize with a desolating pestilence which prostrated half the strength of Rome for resistance. Yet Rome did resist, and successfully, although not triumphantly: we doubt whether under Trajan she could have done much more. That a period followed rank with disorders is true; but these disorders seem to us attributable rather to special and almost accidental causes, than to a thorough break-up of the Roman Empire. When, in so centralized a system as the Roman, a Commodus or a Heliogabalus presided, terrible calamities might justly be expected; but any energetic or virtuous emperor—a Severus, an Alexander Severus, an Aurelian, a Diocletian—at once worked a strange change both at home and abroad. Therefore, even the more confidently because of our belief that the natural tendency of the Roman Imperial system was to decay, but in the gradual way in which natural causes of decay always operate, must we express our dissent from the doctrine of a sudden

Niagara-like interruption to the course of things implied in the assertion, that 'the decline of which Aurelius was the melancholy witness, was irremediable and final, and his pale and 'solitary star was the last apparent in the Roman firmament.'

The only question is as to the character of finality and incurableness which the decline of the Roman power assumed *during the reigns of Antoninus and Aurelius*. The fact of the decline itself must be allowed. The great natural cause of that decay was the essential feature of the Roman system, a quality which had been as actively at work during the Republic as during the Empire. It was the exhaustion of all independent and self-originating life and energy in the provinces, and the reduction of them to utter dependence on the municipality of Rome. By this system, the dominion of Rome was secured against internal convulsions, at the cost of a loss of power to resist external enemies. A Roman citizen might well, as he looked round on every settled district of the world within his ken, and saw it was, so far as it was anything, Roman to the core, forget that races and regions lay beyond the frontiers, against which civilization, as it had with them no sympathy, so it had no arms.

Had the whole world been civilized, the whole world might possibly have become Roman; and then the Roman's proud conviction of the eternity of his empire might have seemed confirmed, unless, or rather until, as is probable, the world had been startled by the dominion suddenly dying a natural death. The only substitute for the want of energy and vigour in the dependencies was the superabundant stock of governing capacity in the city of Rome itself. But this supply failed during the Empire; and thus we find the special cause, which allowed the more general cause which had been working ineffectually hitherto to have its natural operation, in the absence of that once abnormal central vigour which had so long borne up the ever-increasing dead weight of servile dependencies. The Roman form of government, and habits both of thought and action, were so stereotyped and conservative, that any change affected injuriously the whole mass of the empire. Nero's Greek graces, and Domitian's Greek dress at the public games, marked the decadency of the spirit of exclusive nationality which had roused to the utmost the Roman energies, out, as it were, of a spirit of opposition and contrast to the provincials their subjects. In their pride in being unlike all the rest of the world, was the great stimulus with them to exertion, and one of which luxury itself would not have wholly destroyed the force.

But all outward changes would have been but of little importance, except for the great change in the relations between the Roman nobles and the provinces and armies, which was

produced by the introduction of the ill-defined imperial prerogative. This power seemed to relieve the nobles from all the responsibility of looking to the safety of the state; and thus, when an incapable emperor came to the throne, there was in his nobility rather a tendency to encourage, and give fresh momentum to the sovereign's depraved humours, than to check them by a wiser and more virtuous example. 'Et spes et ratio studiorum in Cæsare tantum' might have been said of much more than the aspirations of literary men longing for patronage. In this sense Tacitus might rightly regard the downfall of the oligarchy under the Cæsarean usurpation as 'the fruitful source' of the degradations and miseries by which the later career of 'Rome had been sullied;' inasmuch as the elevation of the Cæsars led immediately to the relaxation of the energies and political and military education of the nobles, so causing the goodness of the government to depend quite exclusively on the perpetuity of that energy in the personal character of the prince which at first had rendered energy in his courtiers superfluous. But that brilliant apologist of the patrician order is unable to excuse his friends from the reproach of having been consenting parties to their own degradation. If they had not, even in the days of the Republic, begun, as a class, the habit of breaking up into factions, each throwing all its cares on a leader; if they had, by their habits of life, vindicated their claims to be the chiefs of the Roman people, the respect, which emperors felt bound to pay them even in their debased condition, shows they might have influenced to any extent the imperial policy, even though compelled by the prince's military power to tolerate his personal chieftainship. But both Juvenal's eighth satire (which we construe as an attempt to taunt to higher pursuits the men whom the poet regarded as the natural chiefs of Rome, rather than, as Mr. Merivale interprets it, as a reflection of the democratic tendencies of the time), and also Pliny's indignation (not, in our eyes, at all 'beyond the occasion,' or 'reflecting on the political capacity of the writer') at senators who could put into the voting-urn tablets written over with ribald jokes (much as though the peers were to scrawl caricatures on their Protest-book), show, that the order, from whom alone the exhausted vigour of the empire could hope to be replenished, had lost all seriousness and feeling of the duties of their rank.

In some other respects, Mr. Merivale seems to us rather unjust to the Romans of the empire. He lightly passes over their claims to rank as social reformers on account of their discoveries in the province of jurisprudence, and even makes it a charge against their capacity that they did not advance beyond this 'elementary science.' One would even gather from his

tone, when he argues that the prefect was obliged to allow full weight to the local law in the refined communities of the East while 'inflicting Quiritary law on the Gauls and Britons in almost all its stringency' (a compliment really to the capacity of these nations), that he supposes the Roman law was still as harsh and tyrannical as in the time of the Decemvirs. But we are guarded, subsequently, from fancying that it was the hardness and local technicalities of the Roman law which hinder him from praising the men of the empire on the subject of jurisprudence, by his assertion, that, generally speaking, education in jurisprudence is much the reverse of education in freedom. 'The most comprehensive, exact, and logical codes, 'from Justinian downwards, have been the actual badges of 'national servitude and degradation.' Now this may be very true as a fact of history, without its having the least bearing upon the claims of the Romans of the empire to admiration as great legal philosophers. The circumstance of the general reception of one scheme of law by all classes in a community, and over a vast extent of territory, is necessarily a sign often of the fall from independence of the men who accept it. But, as many vast empires have existed without possessing a nobly conceived and philosophical system of law, so the inauguration and intelligent reception of such in any empire is of itself a topic for praise, however much a negative condition of its reception the previous overthrow of nationalities may be allowed to be.

Mr. Merivale adduces it as a reproach against the imperial times, that they witnessed so few improvements. He awards them praise as practical engineers, but charges that they observed physical phenomena empirically only; and that, 'in exploring the agencies of the natural world, and turning its forces 'to the use of man, the progress soon reached its limit.' This certainly was the case, and arose, both in Greece and in Italy, partly from the great separation of classes in the State. The only men of leisure who could afford the luxury of a thorough education were the nobles, who looked forwards to military command or to statesmanship. There was no direct relation between them and the classes concerned in the natural production of wealth, and, as the impulse is given to the study of natural philosophy only by the felt wants of life, which wants can be made known only by the working classes of the community who feel them as they arise, questions of this nature seldom were brought under the notice of the leaders of thought, who gave their attention exclusively to the only topics likely to interest that class which composed the whole intellectual public of their day.

In the same way may be explained the utter ignorance of political economy. But, as modern Europe, late into the last century, shared in the same ignorance, and as it was an undiscovered science in the commercial states of Greece, no special fatuity can be imputed to the Romans of the empire, in that their principles of commerce and finance were rude and unphilosophical. This is a subject which even the greatest mercantile activity, a keen insight into the mysteries of natural science, and experience of the most intricate complication of commercial relations, will not always make clear to nations. In fact, are not Mr. Merivale's own views on political economy somewhat at fault, when he treats the scarcity of specie as a fundamental cause of the decline of trade under the Empire? It was almost an impossibility that this science should force itself on the attention of the Romans, when not one of these incentives to its cultivation was present. Their commerce was, compared with the bulk of their dominion, not very great; and, besides that, wholly in the hands of one class, who never believe it for their interest to introduce new theories, or, in fact, any theories at all, into a subject so exclusively, they think, the province of practical men as trade. Besides, as has already been said, no fashion or habit existed among intellectual men of reasoning upon a theme so uninteresting to them as trade, when the whole mystery of life and existence, past, present, and future, was, and then more than at any other period in the world's history, free for them to discuss, unshackled by any bonds of faith or even superstition and fancy. Lastly, and principally, occasions were wanting on which problems of political economy requiring solution were likely to arise. The question of free-trade might, we can imagine, have revealed itself in the States of ancient Greece, with their complicated commercial relations, still more, in the kingdoms of modern Europe. If the clue to this difficulty were not found when the difficulty itself must have been so often presented—as to a Corinthian merchant, or trader in the reign of Elizabeth—it was not likely that it should have come to light at a period when almost the whole of the mercantile world was one empire, and commodities were dealt with by the State, with a view, not to the interests of commerce, but simply to the possibility of making them contribute to the support of the government. In such a state of things many of the greatest problems of political economy, such as the controversy between free-trade and prohibitory tariffs, can never be solved, because the enemy which the science is to confound has not yet raised its head.

The same sort of answer, based on the absence of occasions calling for change, may be made to Mr. Merivale's illustration of

the reluctance shown to improvement under the Empire drawn from the immobility even of the military system. He states that 'changes in tactics and discipline were slight and casual;' that the conformation of the legion under Aurelius showed no advance, as compared with the like force under the auspices of some Republican commander. If there were any change, he appears to think it was in the way rather of deterioration; for he concludes, from the smaller dimensions of camps in the later period, 'that the soldiers of the Empire chose rather to be crowded (50,000 in the room of 19,000) into a narrow space, than execute the laborious works to which the stricter obedience or harder sinews of the republican militia submitted.' Now, in reference even to this question of detail, we think it by no means follows that the mere comparative extent of a camp is any argument at all in favour of the greater energy or discipline of an army; on the contrary, we should, *à priori* (and it is only on *à priori* grounds that Mr. Merivale draws his conclusion), have conceived that it was an improvement, *cæteris paribus*, to circumscribe the line of intrenchments to be guarded, and thereby to reduce the number of men to be withdrawn for this passive task from the available fighting strength of the army. As to the general question, no proof of the sluggishness of the Roman mind at this period can be drawn from the unchanging character of the military tactics and discipline, unless it be first shown, either that this military system admitted of improvement, or that the circumstances of the Roman Empire were such as to make a change desirable. But, apart from some improvement in arms, which the confessed carelessness about natural science put in a great measure beyond the attainment of the ancient world, it is not so very evident that the Roman legion did require a change in its organization. It is never at all necessary to suppose that, because the main features of an organization were of old date, therefore they required remodelling. It is not with military affairs, as with natural philosophy or historical investigations, where it is of the nature of every step to be an advance, but more as with metaphysics, where it is possible to revolve in a circle. Given the arms and *materiel* of war, it is not at all impossible that a nation may, at an early stage of its career, elaborate the idea of the unit of its military force, the phalanx or the legion, which is *for it* the best, both then and for all future time. The adherence to the legion as the unit, if we may so call it, of the system, by no means excluded an infinite variety in combining, and manipulating, and manœuvring the various portions of an army: the campaigns of Agricola, could we investigate them as minutely, would, doubtless, disclose many points of difference from those of Julius Cæsar. But, when we consider the nature

of the opposition which the legion had to encounter, we perceive more completely still how unfair it is to blame the Roman tacticians of the Empire for not introducing changes. The tactics of their foes, whether Gauls, Germans, or Dacians, on one side, and Moors and Parthians on the other, remained the same as of old; the warlike arts which had sufficed for their overthrow once would be equally available at any subsequent time; and, in effect, we find that it was so. When the standards of Rome went down before the barbarian hosts, it was not because the old Roman tactics or organization had become superannuated, but because the men themselves in the opposing armies were changed, and mainly indeed from the success with which the enemies had themselves studied and adopted the Roman art of war.

In other respects besides the art of war, the Roman empire by no means exerted that petrifying influence which Mr. Merivale seems anxious to fix upon it. Of such a government, which, in warlike discipline and enterprise, far surpassed all rivals among contemporary states, and which established foundations for a science of jurisprudence on which even now modern legal reformers build—which has left its mark, materially, on the face of every country which ever owned its sway, and, intellectually, on the language, institutions, nay, the very modes of thought, of races in whose veins flows none of its blood—of such a system, all pervading and influencing, and, so far at least as outward civilization went, all improving, it can scarcely be said, with fairness, that 'it had, in short, no versatility, no 'power of adaptation to meet the varying wants of its outward 'condition; its ideas were not equal to the extension of its 'material dominion; a little soul was lodged in a vast body.' A description which would suit the Chinese empire, or the administration of the Aztecs, can hardly apply to the sovereignty of the Cæsars.

Men and institutions had under the Empire assumed a form under which the modern world can measure them. That stage of the world's history has so far influenced the present, that we can compare *its* principles and acts with our own, and fix the amount of *its* shortcoming. We do not take into account, in criticizing the bias of a Herodotus or Thucydides, we do not even care to mention, that those historians kept slaves; but it is stated as a ground for suspecting the honesty of Tacitus's attacks on imperial morality (and we do not say wholly without justice), that, as himself a master of slaves, he was no unexceptionable judge of the true rights and duties of our social superiors. In fact, as men always judge most strictly their neighbours, so we, justified, as we think, by the confirmation which the final catastrophe is supposed to afford of charges against human

deficiencies, in scrutinizing the faults of that period with an exactness out of which no era whatever of ancient history could come scatheless. But, even morally and politically, it is not clear that imperial Rome stood so very still. Mr. Merivale tells us, that 'a social transformation was already taking shape' in the reign of Hadrian; and also, that the same sovereign introduced a new idea of government, 'suddenly discarding, even in theory, the 'tradition of a Roman municipality as the master and possessor 'of all the soil of the provinces.' That very system itself, slavery, the existence of which is declared, somewhat too broadly, to have 'rendered political freedom and constitutional government impossible,' found in the legislation of the empire certain checks and limitations, which no earlier or contemporary ancient pagan government had cared to devise.

The meagreness of authorities and facts on by far the largest portion, if not the whole, of this most interesting period of history, is the great drawback to the usefulness of its study. Any authoritative and sounding theory about its virtues or vices always has a tendency to collapse, and betray the exceeding scantiness of its skeleton of fact. Sometimes even a minute and laborious investigator, as we believe Mr. Merivale to be, may have touched a hidden causeway, as he felt his way along, or have had an instinct of a spark indicating that somewhere the protruding edge of a buried stratum had been caught by the heel of the passing explorer, and thence constructed a hypothesis, but without affording any means of demonstrating its truth, except a reference to his own subtle intuition of it. Thus, it is tantalizing to a student to be told of that bold idea of Hadrian's, already referred to, of governing the world as 'one homogeneous empire,' without any details being adduced in proof of its existence; or to read that Domitian 'was well 'served by his ministers; and the course of our history will 'show conclusively that, of all the Cæsars, he held himself 'most free from their control and dictation,' when Mr. Merivale's pages contain scarcely the names of the statesmen, much less any details respecting either their services or the emperor's independence of them. But it is still more tantalizing, when we imagine, from the concurrence of evidence contemporary or nearly so, that at last we have some certainty on which to rest, to be informed, that the very uniformity of testimony shows its rottenness, and that 'no doubt it is the duty of the judge to 'lean against the weight of testimony so suspiciously harmonious.' When the scanty springs of meagre facts are themselves represented as poisoned ('for it is by senators, or by the clients of senators, that our history has been entirely written'), we are left to faint of inanition at the threshold of the history

of imperial Rome. When it is stated, as a sign of the blindness of the contemporary historians, that, 'if Vespasian, Trajan, 'Hadrian, Antoninus, are the most virtuous, the most able, the 'most successful of the Cæsars, the secret, as our authorities 'intimate, of their eminence lay in the favour in which they 'held the most august order of the citizens,' what test have we by which, amid the snares alleged to be laid for our credulity by partisanship, we may be able to assure ourselves that the same writers' pictures of the virtues and genius of these great sovereigns are not, equally with the alleged theory as to their source and secret cause, the delusion and snare of inveterate political prejudices? Possibly, if we are not to rely on the descriptions given by the historians of the age, we may have been quite wrong in our conclusions: Domitian may, then, for all we know, have been an angel of light, the victim of a base faction of oligarchical slanderers; and Trajan and the Antonines servile trucklers to the passions and sordid interests of a corrupt noblesse.

In this poverty of materials for historical composition, Mr. Merivale may at all events find much ground for confidence that his work will not be quickly superseded. For *cui bono*? No after-writer could hope to surpass the vigour with which he has described the beginning of the fall of the Roman empire, such as our few authorities have portrayed it to us, or the ingenuity of his views on very many topics. It is certainly rather a hopeless theme for any but an antiquarian, when a bust, a coin, or inscription (materials, themselves scarcely enough utilized by Mr. Merivale in the dearth of others), has to stand in the place of annalists and biographers. The very facts themselves here are, in a great measure, wanting. It is not merely a question how the lights and shadows are to play about the facts of a life, or the details of a policy, but how and whence the facts and details themselves can be extracted. If Mr. Merivale's theory be true, we must suspend our Tacitus and Suetonius, and all their fellows, till fresh evidence can be brought by which to test the honesty of their narratives; while from no quarter whatever can we hope that such evidence is forthcoming, or likely to be. Such, at least, seems to be Mr. Merivale's view; and, although it is rather an exaggeration, we believe it to contain too much substantial truth for him to have reason to fear that any one will be tempted soon to reap after him in a field so barren of attainable grain, although, perhaps, for moderns, of all periods of history the most tempting and interesting.

ART. VI.—1. *Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus.*

Auspiciis augustissimis imperatoris Alexandri II. ex tenebris protraxit, in Europam transtulit ad juvandas atque illustrandas sacras litteras edidit CONSTANTINUS TISCHENDORF. Petropoli. MDCCCLXII.

2. *Aus dem heiligen Lande.* Von CONSTANTIN TISCHENDORF. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1862.

FAITHFUL to his promise, Tischendorf the *Indefatigable* has brought out his fac-simile edition of the Codex Sinaiticus, in the tenth century from the first rise of the now gigantic Russian empire. In less than three years from the time when the MS. was discovered in the closet of the skeuophylax at the monastery of S. Catherine, it has been printed in a type which rivals Baber's edition of the Septuagint from the Codex Alexandrinus, or Kipling's edition of the Codex Bezae. This wonderful piece of typography is now before the world, 'labore multorum annorum intra triennium absoluto,' as the Professor states in his dedication to Alexander II., most august Emperor of all the Russians. The MS. was first discovered February 4, 1859. On February 13, the Professor arrived at Cairo from Mount Sinai; on February 24, the MS. was sent to him at Cairo, and the work of transcription was immediately commenced, with the assistance of two fellow-countrymen, one a doctor of medicine, the other an apothecary.¹ On September 28, 1859, the MS. was finally placed in the hands of the Professor, that he might offer it to the Emperor of Russia. The Professor arrived, with his precious parchments, at S. Petersburg in November, 1859, and in the following month he went with half of them to Leipzig, where he immediately took measures for printing the MS. in fac-simile. At the end of March, 1860, he again repaired to S. Petersburg 'per nives septentrionales,' and in May he returned to Leipzig, bringing with him the whole of the MS. except twenty leaves, which were left to be photographed. Not till July, 1860, were the first sheets in the press. The result is four large and handsome volumes,

¹ While the work of transcription was going on, it seems that a young Englishman actually made a bid for the document. See 'Aus dem heiligen Lande,' p. 117.

the first containing prolegomena, commentary, and twenty-one photo-lithographed plates,¹ the second and third containing portions of the Old Testament and Apocrypha, the fourth containing the New Testament, with the epistle of Barnabas and a fragment of the Shepherd of Hermas. The printing of the last three volumes (those containing the text) was finished in July, 1861. Specimen sheets of these were sent to the International Exhibition in London, May, 1862, and obtained a prize. The dedication to the Emperor is dated Leipzig, 30 Augt. 1862, and the Professor there says, 'ut . . . hodie in 11 Sept.

Tuas manus tradere possem.' On January 7, 1863, Bodley's librarian at Oxford had received the copy for which he had privately subscribed; and his kindness in allowing us to have immediate and free access to the publication has enabled us to gather the materials for this article. We gladly seize this opportunity of thanking him for this and very many other instances of ready attention and uniform courtesy. Now, really, when we consider that Baber's fac-simile edition of the LXX. occupied him with Herculean labours (it is his own phrase) between the years 1812 and 1828,² we may indeed be astonished at the rapidity with which the Codex Sinaiticus has been committed to type and carried through the press. It seems as if steam had introduced an accelerating power into learned pursuits; we only hope (may we be pardoned for venturing to say so) that the present work may not exemplify the old proverb, 'The more haste, the worse speed.'³

It is only due to the Czar to mention, that under his auspices and by his munificence the work has been executed. He may well be proud of such a bloodless trophy to grace the millenary of his empire; glad shall we be if the event show (in spite of Polish troubles) that with him, at all events, *L'Empire c'est la paix*, and that we may hail the publication of an additional most ancient witness to the genuineness of the Gospel text, as a proof that he is not unmindful of what the Gospel is intended to promote, ἐπὶ ἡσυχίας εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας, if we may venture to adopt the reading (*a prima manu*) in the Codex Sinaiticus. Of the original discovery and general character of the Codex Sinaiticus, we endeavoured to give some account in the *Christian Remembrancer*, January, 1861. Professor

¹ Seventeen plates represent actual pages in the MS., the other four represent passages selected from different parts of the MS. and from other MSS.

² The Prince Regent authorized the commencement of the work in 1814, The Prolegomena are dated Kal. July, 1828. Mr. Baber had published the Psalms from the Codex Alexandrinus in 1812.

³ One instance we may perhaps be able to produce.

Tischendorf repeats in his prolegomena some of the details which he had given in his previously published 'Notitia,' but as these have in various ways been brought before the public, we will pass on at once to the fresh information conveyed in the prolegomena to the edition.

I. THE TYPOGRAPHICAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE IMPERIAL EDITION.—Two alphabets were engraved in brass, one in characters of a size to correspond as nearly as possible to the average appearance of the letters in the text, the other in smaller characters, to correspond to the letters employed in the notes. A third alphabet, in still smaller characters, was also cut to represent the small characters which occur at the end of a line, or where, from want of space, the letters are written more closely together. In some cases two letters were cut together on one block, as AY and °Y; in other cases single letters were so cut, that two could be placed close to each other, as AT, Y, ΔYο, Λ*. As the work went on, and from time to time new forms or new combinations of letters made their appearance, the Professor again had recourse to the engravers, who supplied fresh modifications of shape or size in the letters τ, ω, ο, ξ, ϗ for Μ, κ for KAI, joined letters, as NH, MH, ΓH, MNH; abbreviations $\overline{\Pi}$; and even different lengths of super-written lines, as in $\overline{\Theta Y}$, $\overline{\Theta Y}$, \overline{O} , \overline{O} , \overline{O} . But what appears to have involved more labour than anything else, is this; the spaces between the letters in the MS. are by no means uniform. Determined that his fac-simile should, in this respect also, be faithful to the original, the Professor ordered brass spacing-lines to be cut, so that the different breadths of blank between each letter might be correctly represented. Of these he says that more than 100,000 different spacings were required for the New Testament alone. When we bear in mind that in the process of printing not only the letters but the spaces had to be corrected, and are told further, that thirty columns of quadruple text had to be copied out, set up, corrected, and printed *per week*, we may well be astonished at these truly 'Herculean labours.'

The printing was put into the hands of Giesecke and Devrient, 'duumvirorum excolenda arte typographica clarorum.' The Professor adds, 'Nihil autem unquam operis typographicis traditum est, nisi quod ipsi e codice, quem nunquam de manibus emisimus, transcripsimus, variisque signis ad imitandam veterem scripturam auximus.' If we understand rightly the statement made in the prolegomena, it would appear

that the *types* were corrected after they were set up by the compositor, that is, we suppose, before they were put to paper. This laborious, but most important work, was performed by friends, including one named Gustavus Mühlman, and Clement Tischendorf, nephew to the Professor. Lastly, the Professor himself corrected the types 'ad ipsum codicem.'

Delarue and Co. of London supplied a kind of paper very like parchment, but of this no more was ordered than would suffice for twenty copies. These copies *de luxe*, will, we presume, be reserved like 'imperial' Tokayer Ausbruch, for 'Emperors and Kings' alone; but ordinary mortals may well be content with the ordinary vintage, especially since it turns out that this imitation-parchment is (like certain high-priced wines) rather too dry—for printing purposes. Professor Tischendorf seems to be a little disappointed with the results of the photographing process; at all events he was not satisfied with the photographers of S. Petersburg. Accordingly, out of the twenty pages which he intended to represent by the photolithographic process, only ten were done at S. Petersburg; in these ten, however, great improvement was made; the remaining ten were executed at Leipzig; hence, in the brief notice which precedes the tabulæ, the title of Tabula Petropolitana is prefixed to some, of Tabula Lipsiensis to others. But evanescence and erasures are formidable foes to photographing a MS.; nor does a photograph represent accurately the different colours of ink.¹ There is in the first volume, besides the prolegomena and photo-lithographed plates, a commentary upon each single page of the fac-simile. The commentary mentions whether the page is written on the outer or inner side of the skin, and also the corrections made, either by the original scribes (for there were more than one) or by subsequent hands. These corrections, which the Professor in his 'Notitia' calculated at 8,000, have turned out to be nearly double that number, and have required more than 1,500 notes in the way of notice and elucidation. There are as many as 1,000 erasures, and these give the MS. in some parts a palimpsestic appearance. It will be observed, that in the printed fac-simile very nearly all the corrections are eliminated from the text and thrown into the commentary. In this respect the edition of the Codex Sinaiticus differs from that of the Codex Friderico-Augustanus.

II. PARCHMENT, INK, CORRECTIONS, &c. OF THE MS.—The parchment is generally 'sufflava' in colour, thin, and smooth, although of course the leaves vary; some are worm-

¹ This we are enabled to state after comparing a photographed page (otherwise perfectly rendered) of the Codex Laudianus with the original.

eaten. One skin is folded so as to make two leaves or four pages. The inner side of the skin, which was next the flesh of the animal, is softer and finer; the outer side, which came next the hair, is coarser. The skins are so arranged that a pair of the coarser pages is succeeded by a pair of the finer, and conversely. To this arrangement there are very few exceptions. The skin is probably that of the antelopes which abound in the deserts of Egypt and Libya, although the Professor intimates that the skin of the donkey is not unsuited to the purpose. A single skin then (whether of antelope or donkey) being once folded so as to make two leaves or four pages, these skins are then made up into sets of four each, called quaternions, and numbered accordingly by quaternions. It is obvious that one quaternion, as it consists of four skins, must contain eight leaves, or sixteen pages. This arrangement we know to be as old at least as the time of Constantine. For when the Emperor wrote to Eusebius, telling him, on account of the increasing number of churchmen and churches at Constantinople, to have fifty copies of the Scriptures (πεντήκοντα σωματία) made for church use, legible and portable (εὐανάγνωστά τε καὶ πρὸς τὴν χρῆσιν εὐμετακόμιστα) by artists practised in calligraphy (ὑπὸ τεχνιτῶν καλλιγράφων καὶ ἀκριβῶς τὴν τεχνὴν ἐπισταμένων) on prepared skins (ἐν διφθέραις ἐγκατασκευούς); Eusebius states that he carried out the emperor's commands, and sent the ternions and quaternions in very expensively ornamented volumes (ἐν πολυτελῶς ἡσκευασμένοις τεύχεσι τρισσὰ καὶ τετρασσὰ διαπεμφάντων ἡμῶν). The τρισσὰ or ternions were skins arranged by threes (See Eus. de Vita Const. IV. 36, 37). Has the Emperor of all the Russians had the good fortune, in the Codex Sinaiticus, to light upon one of these fifty copies prepared by order of his illustrious predecessor in imperialism, the founder of Constantinople?

The first leaf in the Codex Sinaiticus is the last half-skin in quaternion $\Lambda\Delta$ and ends with the word *υπερ*. The quaternion $\Lambda\epsilon$ follows, not in the Codex Sinaiticus, but in the Codex Friderico-Augustanus, commencing on its first leaf with the word *βασαηλ*, of which the first syllable *κα* was omitted by the scribe. The passage is 1 Chron. xi. 22. Here then the one Codex exactly fits on to the other. Then follows, in the Codex Friderico-Augustanus, the quaternion $\Lambda\epsilon$ complete; then the first three leaves of quaternion $\Lambda\zeta$, ending with *των αδελφων ημων* (Tob ii. 2); the last five leaves beginning with *εκ νινευτων αιχμαλωτων*, being in the Codex Sinaiticus; here, again, the one Codex exactly fits on to the other. Then follows, in the Codex Sinaiticus, quaternion $\Lambda\eta$, of which the

last leaf has perished. Then quaternion $\Lambda\Theta$ complete. Half only of quaternion M appears to be in existence.¹ From $\overline{M\Delta}$ to $\overline{M\epsilon}$ are six complete quaternions.² Then follow quaternion $\overline{N\Z}$ and the first six leaves of quaternion \overline{NH} . The quaternions already mentioned contain portions of the historical and prophetic books, and are published in Vol. II. of the fac-simile edition. Vol. III. contains fourteen complete quaternions, from $\overline{N\Theta}$ to \overline{OB} . Here are the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song, Wisdom, Siracides, Job. These books are written two columns to a page, and in lines of varying length. The last volume (IV.), in which are contained all the books of the New Testament, has twenty quaternions, beginning with \overline{OI} and ending with \overline{QB} . Of these the quaternion \overline{OH} (in S. Luke) consists of seven leaves only, and the divisions marked Π (in which occurs the end of S. John's Gospel) and \overline{Q} (in the Epistle of S. Barnabas) are ternions, as they consist of six leaves only. Of quaternion \overline{QA} two leaves only are remaining, those in which the Epistle of S. Barnabas ends. Of the quaternion which follows, six leaves only with half of the seventh and a small fragment remain. It is evident, from the continuous numbering of the quaternions, that the Old and New Testaments were regarded as one volume.

The original size of the leaves was rather larger, than at present. This is proved by the loss of letters from notes added in the right-hand margin, and of the old quaternions, which were written in red at the top of the page. The present numbering of the quaternions was added previously to the binding of the Codex. The actual measurement of the leaves, as we now have them, is given in Plate XIX. of the photo-lithographs, from which it appears that a leaf measures $13\frac{3}{8}$ inches longitudinally, by $14\frac{5}{8}$ inches vertically.

Ruled lines were employed both for the columns and the lines in each column; but for the latter the points at each end sometimes suffice. Owing to the fineness of the parchment, the line drawn on one side shows through so as to answer for the other.

The colour of the ink is of various hues, being for the most part 'fuscum,' often 'cineraceum,' sometimes 'fulvum,' sometimes 'e fusco rutilans.' The Professor adds, 'Plerumque

¹ So stated in Prol. But in the fac-simile quaternion M has eight leaves, MA four.

² Quaternion $\overline{M\epsilon}$ ends with Jer. x. 25, $\mu\eta\ \epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\tau\alpha\ \sigma\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota$. At this very point the Codex Friderico-Augustanus goes on with quaternion \overline{MZ} at the words $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \gamma\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\alpha\tau\ \alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \sigma\upsilon\omicron\mu\alpha$, and so on to the end of Jeremiah. At three points then the two MSS. exactly fit each other—in Chronicles, in Tobit, in Jeremiah.

³ HA by misprint in the prolegomena.

aliquem nitorem habet.' The earliest corrections do not differ much in the colour of the ink from that of the original writing. One corrector used 'atramento pullo.' As it is impossible to realize these different shades without autopsy of the MS. we simply describe them by the Professor's own terms.

Written in red ink are the titles and numbers of the Psalms, titles added in the Song, the Ammonian sections and canons of Eusebius, the inscription of Ecclesiastes (here the letters, except the ι, are only half in rubric), ornamental marks, as at the end of the Psalms and S. Mark.

The MS. in its original state had very little punctuation, and that was of the simplest kind. The books written in two divisions to the page (those contained in Vol. III. of the fac-simile edition) had none whatever. In these books (except the Psalms) all, and elsewhere most of the punctuation, was supplied by the correctors. The portion of the MS. written four columns to a page (contained in Vol. II. and IV. of the fac-simile edition) had originally some, but very little, punctuation: many columns and whole pages are without any points at all. Blank spaces are, however, occasionally left in a line, and words of similar import, when placed in juxtaposition, are distinguished, sometimes by points, sometimes by being placed in different lines. See Rom. i. 29, sqq., Gal. v. 19, sqq.¹ Sometimes a double point, like our colon, is employed: this or the single point are often added by the correctors where the scribe had left a blank space. The scribe has, however, occasionally added points where there was no space, as in fol. 62, col. 4, he pointed *πονηρια'κακια'πλεονεξια*. Care must be taken not to confuse the end-points of the ruled lines for punctuation-points. But, indeed, there is the greatest uncertainty about the whole system of punctuation in the MS., and recourse must be had to the original.

Examples of the apostrophe are found in *ιουδειθ', δαυειδ', ιωσηφ', εφρεμ', ιερουσαλημ', ιματια' αυτων, κατεπατησα' αυτοις*. We find *ιωB' ιωB' ιωB*. The apostrophes are chiefly supplied by Correctors B and C. The printed fac-simile gives only the apostrophes of the scribe.

1	πορνια	φαρμακια
	ακαθαρσια	εχθραι
	ασελγια	ερις
	ειδωλολατρεία	ζηλοι
		θυμοι
		εριθειαι
		διχοστασιαι
		αιρεσις
		φθονοι
		μεθαι
		κωμαι' και τα θ.

The mark } occurs, sometimes to join two parts of a word, as *οικοδομια, ψευδεσθαι, αναρμοστον, εθρυπτεν*, sometimes as an ornament.

This mark belongs to the most ancient documents, such as papyri, the fragments of the Octateuch from Origen, and the Vatican MS.

Other small lines, as \diagup , are chiefly supplied by Correctors A and B.

The diæretic points over *ι* and *υ* were oftener omitted than placed by the scribe, but they have been very frequently supplied by the correctors.

Ī and Ÿ are often written $\bar{\text{I}}$ and $\bar{\text{Y}}$, seldom $\dot{\text{Y}}$.

Abbreviated forms are $\overline{\Theta\zeta}$, $\overline{\text{K}\zeta}$, $\overline{\text{I}\zeta}$, $\overline{\text{X}\zeta}$, $\overline{\text{Y}\zeta}$, $\overline{\Pi\text{HP}}$, $\overline{\text{MHP}}$, $\overline{\Pi\text{NA}}$, $\overline{\Pi\text{NIKOC}}$, $\overline{\text{ANOC}}$, $\overline{\text{OYNOC}}$, with their different cases; also $\overline{\text{CPC}}$, $\overline{\text{CTP}\Theta\text{H}}$, $\overline{\text{ECP}\Omega\text{H}}$, with $\overline{\Delta\text{AD}}$, $\overline{\text{IAHM}}$, $\overline{\text{IEAM}}$, $\overline{\text{IHAM}}$, $\overline{\text{IHA}}$, $\overline{\text{ICA}}$, $\overline{\text{ICH}\Lambda}$.

We find also $\overset{\circ}{\text{M}}$, for *μου* and *μοι*, $\overset{+}{\Pi}$ for *προς* and *προ*. *ν* at the end of a line is very often denoted by a line over the preceding letter, as *ειπε, τω, πα*.

There are also conjoined letters, as *NH*, &c.

Numbers are written sometimes in full, sometimes with letters.

The monogram of Christ, $\chi\rho$, occurs three times in the Codex Sinaiticus, once at the end of Jeremiah, twice at the end of Isaiah. It is found twice in the Alexandrine, four times in the Vatican MSS.

Professor Tischendorf distinguishes four different, though coeval hands, in the production of the original text. Yet, though different, they wrote much alike. Scribe A wrote the fragment of Chronicles, the first book of Maccabees, and the New Testament, except seven leaves: he wrote also the epistle of Barnabas, which commences in the next column (2^d) to the Apocalypse. Scribe B wrote the prophetic books and the Shepherd of Hermas. Scribe C wrote the books in double column (Vol. III.). Scribe D wrote the books of Tobit and Judith, the first three and a half leaves of IV Maccabees, two leaves of S. Matthew (10 and 15), the last leaf of S. Mark (29,) and the first leaf of S. Luke (30), the second leaf of 1 Thess. (88), the third leaf of Heb. (91), and perhaps the beginning of the Apocalypse, down to the words *ο μαρτυς, ο πιστος, ο πρωτοτοκος των νεκρων*, in the first column of page 126*. Of these scribes, A and B, C and D, most resemble each other. Specimens of each kind of handwriting are given in the photolithographed plates.

The rubricated additions in the Old Testament are by another hand from that which wrote the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons in the Gospels, although there is no great difference in the characters.

Scribe D wrote the page-titles and subscriptions in Tobit and Judith, the inscriptions to both books of Maccabees, with the page-title of page 35. He seems to have made it one part of his business to look up these page-titles, but has made a mistake in writing *αγγελος ι*, in Vol. II. fol. 82. He has also written *ασματα* in Vol. III. p. 63.

What are written at the beginning and end of each book, commencing from the subscriptions to the two books of Maccabees, down to Malachi, and from the Psalms down to Job, are in the same hand as the text. The Psalms have no inscription or page-titles.

In the New Testament portion of the MS., the page-titles of the Evangelists, with the subscriptions to S. Mark and S. John, were written by Scribe D: the subscription to S. Luke by Scribe A. Scribe A wrote the subscriptions to the Pauline Epistles, except 2 Thess., where Scribe D wrote the last page and the subscription. In the New Testament, as in the Old Testament portion, Scribe D bestowed much attention upon the page-titles: but from Galatians onwards, the inscriptions and page-titles were added by the same hand which noted the *στίχοι*: from which it would seem, that he who added the *στίχοι*, is of the same date as the original scribes. Scribe D seems not to have cared about these *στίχοι*: at all events, 1 Thess. has them not, and the last part of this Epistle was written by scribe D. In the inscription and page-titles to the Colossians, the reading fluctuates between *κολοσσαις* and *κολασσαις*. The scribe himself has written *κολοσσαις* at the commencement of the Epistle, and *κολασσαις* in the subscription. There is a similar variety in the Codex Vaticanus, with respect to the spelling of this word. The subscriptions to the Acts, Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse, Barnabas, were by the scribe; but the inscriptions to all these, except Barnabas, and their page-titles, were added by Scribe D. In the first part of the Revelation, Scribe D wrote at the top of the page *αποκαλυψις ιωαννου*, but the after page-titles and the subscription are *αποκαλυψεως ιωαννου*. In the Shepherd, the handwriting of the page-titles differs hardly at all from that of the text. Although, in the Professor's opinion, these four different hands are to be made out in the original writing of the MS., yet he remarks that diversity of hands does not necessarily imply diversity of dates. The hands were, in his opinion, contemporaneous, *put on* simultaneously, that the work might be completed with greater expedition.

With regard to the correctors, it may be first noted that Scribe D, besides writing his own share of the text, himself acted as corrector to his brother hands. He supplied the *διόρθωσιν*, a work which is distinct from that of collation with the original copy, and is so distinguished in a note added to the books *εσδρας β* and *εσθηρ*, in the Codex Friderico-Augustanus, where we read *αντωνινος ομολογητης αντεβαλεν, παμφιλος διορθωσα*. It is clear that the Codex Sinaiticus was corrected from other MSS. besides the original MS. from which it was copied. This is proved by the fluctuation between two readings, and by the blending of two readings, which so often occurs in the New Testament portion of the MS. Thus, in page 98*, 6 (Tit. iii. 2), we find *ενδικνυσθαι σπουδηντα προς παντας ανθρωπους*:¹ the scribe had for *σπουδηντα* originally written *πραυτητα*, but in altering this reading to *σπουδην*, he left the syllable *τα*, which really belongs to *πραυτητα*. So p. 122*, 14 (2 Pet. ii. 15), there is written *βεωροσσορ*,² made up of the two readings *βεωρ* and *βοσσορ*. So in p. 120*, 28 (1 Pet. ii. 12), may be traced the two readings *δοξασουσιν* and *τρεμουσιν*.³

Of the correctors, properly so called, as distinct from any of the scribes, Corrector A denotes the hand who made the earliest, probably contemporaneous corrections: these are written as elegantly as the original: of them the Professor writes: 'In *Novo Testamento correctiones A ad omnes partes, exceptis 'apocalypsi et Barnaba, pertinuerunt.'*

Corrector B was a *vir doctus*, and meant to bring the writing into ship-shape order. He began adding with a most bountiful hand, in the first page of S. Matthew, apostrophes, breathings, accents, &c.; but, alas! his resolution soon began to fail: the third leaf betrays a great falling off; afterwards he becomes still more chary of his finishing strokes, and touched up only a few places in the other Gospels.

Corrector B^a denotes the corrections which fluctuate between Corrector A and Corrector B. As he is dubbed B^a, not A^b, we presume he comes nearer to Corrector B. At all events, his workmanship shows a 'manum doctam,' and is to be found chiefly in the lemmata (or running headings) superscribed in the Acts, and in the numbering of the sections there.

Now follow, according to the Professor, a brace of correctors, C^a and C^b, whose handiwork may be recognised both in the Septuagint and in the New Testament. Most of the corrections in the prophetic books are by C^b. C^a corrected the books

¹ Altered by Corrector C to *ενδικνυμενους πραστητα*.

² Altered by Corrector C to *βοσσορ οσ*.

³ i.e. *δοξασουτρεμουσιν*. Altered by Corrector C to *δοξασωσιν*.

written in double column. Both pairs of hands touched up the Gospels, C^a correcting the Pauline Epistles, the Acts, Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse, Shepherd (Barnabas he seems to have passed over): as in these latter books he appears without his *double*, the Professor here extracts his *a*th root, and calls him simply C. It may be remarked, that this corrector uses (in a note) the form most usual in the oldest text, *εραυνησω*, that he sometimes added *ν* *εφελκυστ.*, and restored *ουτως* before a consonant. Neither C^a nor C^b used accents, and of their writing the Professor says, 'Elegantiam scripturæ neuter eorum affectavit, scribebant non ut librarii, sed ut viri docti tum solebant scribere.' Both correctors were some centuries later than the scribes, but not far distant in time from each other.

Corrector C^c corrected passages in both Testaments; he added various marks, and the numbers in the sections of Isaiah: also, it appears that he was in the habit of using the MS. for devotional purposes, for he added in the margin *ωρεον* (*i.e.* *ωραιον*) to what, we presume, were his favourite portions. Whether he added *αρχη* and *τελος* to the lections in Isaiah, is doubtful. He seems to have bestowed much attention upon Job, where he often expunged corrections made by C^a. He, too, probably reviewed Barnabas.

Corrector C^d appears only in the Apocalypse; the colour of his ink agrees with that of C^c. An after-hand touched up the writing on the softer side of the skins, and renewed many pages in the books of the Prophets, by inking over evanescent letters. He added some notes in Arabic (generally lemmata), and occasionally emended the text. This corrector of the prophetic books the Professor calls D. The Greek characters which he employs belong probably to the eighth century. The corrector, called D, of the Shepherd, is a different hand.

Corrector E, of the twelfth century, was the one who made OC into ΘC, in 1 Tim. iii. 6.

Some of the correctors have kindly favoured us with their names, as one Theophylact, a Dionysius, and a Hilarion. The Professor supposes they were all brethren in the convent at Mount Sinai.

Before we leave this part of our subject, we must return to the quaternions. It has been before indicated that there is a double numbering of the quaternions—one older, the other more recent. The older numberings were written in the tops of the inner margins,¹ in the New Testament in red ink, in the Old Testament in reddish brown (*colore lurido*). The second numberings were written in the right-hand upper corner of the

¹ 'Summis marginibus interioribus.'

outer margin, generally in very black ink (the Morrell's registration-ink of the day, it may be supposed). Of the more ancient numberings in the historical and prophetic books of the Old Testament, there remain only quaternion \overline{MT} , and traces of the quaternion \overline{NZ} .¹ In the books written in double column, there remain the greater number, either complete or in part, and these all agree with the numberings by the later hand. In the New Testament, the more ancient numberings of the quaternions have been cut off. The Pauline Epistles commence with quaternion \overline{IA} , added by the later hand; but from this quaternion to \overline{QB} , traces of the older numbers are everywhere seen. But here the two numberings differ, for the later numberings \overline{IA} , \overline{IB} , \overline{IF} , answer to the older numberings \overline{IB} , \overline{IF} , \overline{ID} , respectively; and so to the end, the older numberings are one ahead of the later. On account of the difference, the second letter in the more ancient numberings has been erased, together with \overline{Q} entire. Possibly a quaternion was lost between the Gospels and Pauline Epistles, or between Job and S. Matthew. The second numberings might have been added in the eighth or ninth century.

III. Now comes the important question, WHEN WAS THE CODEX SINAITICUS WRITTEN?

As to external evidence, there are absolutely no data whatever. The original writers made no note of their handiwork. The brethren of the monastery have no tradition about it. When the Professor says that the MS. must have been in the monastery 'ex multis sæculis,' we must be on our guard, for the wish may have been father to the thought. He supposes that Dionysius, Hilarion, and Theophylact, whose names do appear in the work, were Sinaitic brethren: this may be so, but the point has still to be proved. He says, it may, perhaps, be shown from the annals of the monastery that these three persons lived in the twelfth century, though he admits that their names do not occur in the list of Archbishops at that period. Perhaps it *may*, but we must not, therefore, assume it as a fact. The monastery was built A.D. 530, by order of Justinian, and has remained up to the present time. 'Now,' says the Professor, 'we may very well believe that the Emperor took care to furnish the monastery with MSS. &c. from Alexandria.' It is most likely that he did; but how can it be shown that this MS. was among the number? We must come, then, to other considerations to help us in fixing the date of the MS.

1. With regard to the writing, it resembles that of the ancient

¹ The ancient numbers are not represented in the printed fac-simile.

papyri, except in those properties which are peculiar to papyri. The characters are simple, yet elegant; free from the ornaments of later centuries; yet herein lies its beauty. It is *simplex munditiis*, 'when unadorned, adorned the most.' 'Ut breviter dicam, quo antiquior est scriptura, eo magis artificio atque ornatu artificioso vacare, et nativam quandam pulchritudinem præ se ferre solet' (Prol. 12). There are numberless places where the original scribes did not even double-dot their I's and Y's. The general character of the letters resembles that in the Vatican MS. and the Saravian Octateuch. It agrees with the Vatican in two forms of the Omega, and in having no initial of larger size; with the Herculaneum rolls in the smaller letters at the end of a line, in the two forms M, Π, in the mark } &c. Also the great scarcity of punctuation indicates an early date. All these points may be granted; but the question may still be asked, Is there anything to *prove* the MS. earlier than the fifth century?

2. The columnar form of writing seems to mark the period of transition from the *volume*, properly so called, to the book. Now, as Hug argued the antiquity of the Vatican MS. from its tri-columnar pages, so from the quadricolumnar pages of the Codex Sinaiticus the Professor argues *à fortiori* for its early date.

3. The defects in orthography and grammar agree with the phenomena in the more ancient MSS. The Codex Sinaiticus is full of itacisms.

4. In the Codex Sinaiticus, the Pauline Epistles precede the Acts. This arrangement agrees (says the Professor) with that of the oldest Syriac version.¹

5. The inscriptions and subscriptions are extremely simple, e.g. *πραξις*.

6. The Codex Sinaiticus has the Ammonian sections, and the Eusebian canons. These were inserted, perhaps, after the corrections made by Corrector A; but if they were added by the scribe (and the handwriting is not dissimilar), this would not be fatal to the supposition that the MS. is as old as the middle of the fourth century, since at about that time the sections began to be adopted by the writers of the MSS. The Professor thinks it most likely that they were in the fifty MSS. written by command of Constantine, A.D. 331. There is, however, no proof of this; and we must remark that the presence of the sections is generally supposed to indicate *not* the earliest class of MSS. Thus the Vatican MS. has them not; but has, instead, sections peculiar to itself, with the exception of the Codex Zacynthius.

¹ We believe that the Syriac MSS. of the New Testament in the Vatican and Bodleian libraries do not support this statement.

As this last-named MS. is of the eighth century, the Professor thinks that this fact rather takes off from the supposed antiquity of the *Capitulatio Vaticana*. But the reply may be made, that the *Codex Zacynthius* might have been copied from an ancient MS. At all events, this must be allowed: if the presence of the sections is compatible with the fact that a MS. was written about A.D. 350, then, so far as this one argument is concerned, the *Codex Alexandrinus* might have been written about the same time.

7. The *Codex Sinaiticus* agrees with the *Codex Vaticanus* in not having the longer sections of the Gospels called *κεφάλαια* or *τίτλοι*. These sections were made after the middle of the fourth century.

8. The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Shepherd of Hermas*, seem in the *Codex Sinaiticus* to have been included in the canon of the New Testament, and as there are six leaves lost between *Barnabas* and *Hermas*, these might have contained another of the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*. It would seem, then, that the presence of these writings indicates a period earlier than the time when the canon was settled in its present form. Here again it must be remarked, that in the *Codex Alexandrinus* the two *Epistles of S. Clement* are expressly included in the canon of the New Testament. So far then, as this one consideration goes, the *Codex Alexandrinus* might be of the same date as the *Codex Sinaiticus*.

It is to be observed that certain notes at the end of *Esdras* and *Esther*, in the *Codex Frid.-Aug.*, which appear to prove a later origin for the MS., are really the work of Correctors C^a and C^b.

9. All the correctors, except the last, used uncial characters. There is no other instance of so many correctors having all used uncial characters. It may be remarked that this does not prove much, as the Professor himself makes out that some of these very correctors who wrote in uncials, were some centuries later than the scribes. If they were correcting for church-use, would they not use uncials? Again, even in the eighth century, the ink had become so pale in many places, that it had to be retouched. Indeed, it had been retouched before. This is one of the points which has to be examined. Is the Professor right in assigning the eighth century as the date for retouching the MS.? May not the fact that this was not the first retouching, indicate something faulty in the ink? If so, we cannot depend on this argument for the antiquity of the MS.

So far then as we have already gone, the *Codex Vaticanus* agrees with the *Codex Sinaiticus* in the general character of the letters, in the absence of initial letters, and of the *κεφάλαια*,

and in the great simplicity of the inscriptions and subscriptions. The two MSS. differ in the arrangement of the books in the New Testament, and in the number of columns to a page: the Codex Sinaiticus has the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons: the Codex Vaticanus has them not, but has a Capitulation peculiar almost to itself. So far then it does not appear very clearly what are the grounds on which we are to pronounce the Codex Sinaiticus older than the Codex Vaticanus. If the quadricolumnar form of writing is more ancient than the tricolumnar form, this may be compensated by the presence of the Ammonian sections in the one document, and their absence in the other. But—

10. The main evidence on which the Professor relies to establish the antiquity of the Codex Sinaiticus, is the internal character of the text itself.

Eusebius (d. 340), says, according to the Professor, that the accurate copies of S. Mark's Gospel ended with the words *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ*¹ (S. Mark xvi. 8). S. Jerome,² too, intimates that this last section (beginning from xvi. 9) was not in all the Greek books. Now, up to the time of the discovery of the Codex Sinaiticus, all existing Greek MSS. of S. Mark's Gospel, amounting to more than 500, do, with one exception, contain this final section: the one exception is the Codex Vaticanus, confessedly the oldest extant MS., which ends at the words *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ*. The Codex Sinaiticus agrees in this respect with the Codex Vaticanus: both together confirm the statement of Eusebius: and the non-appearance of the passage in these two MSS. may be taken as an indication that they were

¹ Eusebius does not state this as in his own person, but as one form which the answer to a certain difficulty might take. (Ad Marinum. Scr. nov. coll. Mai, tom. i. p. 61.)

Πῶς παρὰ μὲν τῷ Ματθαίῳ ὡς σαββάτων φαίνεται ἐξηγερούμενος ὁ σωτὴρ, παρὰ δὲ τῷ Μάρκῳ πρὸς τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων; Τοῦτον διττὴ ἂν εἴη ἡ λύσις· ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὸ κεφάλαιον αὐτὸ τὴν τοῦτο φάσκουσιν περικεπῆν ἀθετῶν, εἰποὶ ἂν μὴ ἐν ἅπασιν αὐτὴν φέρεσθαι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου· τὰ γοῖν ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων τὸ τέλος περιγράφει τῆς κατὰ τὸν Μάρκον ἱστορίας ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ ὁφθέντος νεανίσκου ταῖς γυναιξὶ καὶ εἰρηκότος αὐταῖς, 'Μὴ φοβείσθε' Ἰησοῦν (ἤτετε τὸν Ναζαρεθνόν,) καὶ τοῖς ἐξῆς, οἷς ἐπιλέγει. 'Καὶ ἀκούσασαι ἔφυγον καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ' ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ σχεδὸν ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου περιγράφεται τὸ τέλος· τὰ δὲ ἐξῆς σπανίως ἐν τισιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσι φερόμενα περιττὰ ἂν εἴη, καὶ μάλιστα εἴπερ ἔχοιεν ἀντιλογίαν τῇ τῶν λοιπῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν μαρτυρίᾳ· ταῦτα μὲν οὖν εἶποι ἂν τις παραιτούμενος καὶ πάντῃ ἀναιρῶν περιττὸν ἐρώτημα. Ἄλλος δὲ τις οὐδ' ὅτι οὐδὲν τολμᾶν ἀθετεῖν τῶν ὁπωσοῦν ἐν τῇ τῶν εὐαγγελίων γραφῇ φερομένων, διπλῆν εἶναι φησὶ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν, κ.τ.λ.

² Epist. ad Hedibiam (Ep. exx. tom. iv. p. 172), quest. 3. Hujus questionis duplex solutio est. Aut enim non recipimus Marci testimonium, quod in raris fertur Evangelis, omnibus Græciæ libris pene hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus, præsertim cum diversa atque contraria Evangelistis ceteris narrare videatur. Aut hoc respondendum, quod uterque (Mt. et Mc.) verum dixerit : etc.

written before the section began to appear in the MSS. And there is a further point which the Professor has not noticed, which appears to be an additional argument in his favour. M. Burgon remarks (*Guardian*, Aug. 22, 1860, p. 751), 'It is not so generally known, with reference to this last omission, that besides the blank remainder of the column after the words ἐφοβούντο γάρ, it leaves a whole column blank; thereby intimating, in the most eloquent manner possible, that there has been something consciously left out. For that blank column at the end of S. Mark's Gospel is the only blank column in the whole Codex.' Now, in the Codex Sinaiticus, S. Mark's Gospel ends in the fourth line of the second column in the page.¹ Then in the third column commences S. Luke's Gospel, with the heading at the top of the page, *κατα λουκαν*. The 'eloquent' blank whole column then in the Codex Vaticanus may indicate that while the transcriber conformed to the τὰ ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων mentioned by the apologist in Eusebius, and so omitted our final section, he yet wrote at a time when that final section was beginning to find its way into the copies, and so left room in case there should be occasion to insert it. The want of such whole blank column in the Codex Sinaiticus may point to a yet earlier date for the transcription of the MS. There was then no question about inserting the doubtful passage. We may add that it is omitted in *k* alone of the Latin MSS. (Taurinensis, 5th or 4th cent.), and in certain MSS. of the Armenian, Æthiopic, and Arabic versions.

Again, in Eph. i. 1, the existing MSS. read τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὐσιν ἐν ἐφεσῶ. So read Stephens and the Moscow edition. Yet both Origen and Basil, and probably Marcion, read the passage without the words ἐν ἐφεσῶ.² This omission is confirmed

¹ The part of the fourth line unoccupied by the letters, is filled up by an ornamental pattern, which is continued in the next line, and has a similar pattern (vertical) at right angles to it on the side. Then follows a blank space in the second column, to the extent of five intervening lines. Then follows the subscription εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ μαρκον in three lines, but occupying, with its ornamentation, about the space of five lines. Then follows a blank space to the end of the second column.

² Origen. Cat. p. 102 (Cramer) 'Ἐριγένης δὲ φησιν 'Ἐπὶ μόνον 'Εφεσίῳ εἰρημεν κείμενον τὸ 'τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὐσιν.' Basil. adv. Eun. II. 19. Tom. I. pp. 254 E. 255 A. ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς 'Εφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλων ὡς γνησίῳ ἡνωμένοις τῷ ὄντι δι' ἐπιγνώσεως, ὄντας αὐτοὺς ἰδιαζόντως ὠνόμασεν, εἰπὼν 'τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὐσιν, καὶ πιστεῖς ἐν Χριστῷ 'Ἰησοῦ. οὕτω γὰρ καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδώκασι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων εὐρήκαμεν.

Epiph. adv. Hær. I. III. p. 374. προσέθετο δὲ [Marcion], ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ 'Ἀποστολικῷ καλουμένῳ, καὶ τῆς καλουμένης πρὸς Λαοδικίας . . . Συναδόντως μὲν τῇ πρὸς 'Εφεσίους, ὁ Μαρκεῖον, καὶ ταύτας τὰς κατὰ σου μαρτυρίας ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης πρὸς Λαοδικίας συνήγαγες κατὰ σου μαρτυρίας.

Tert. adv. Marc. v. 11 . . . epistola, quam nos ad Ephesios perscriptam habemus, hæretici vero ad Laodiceos. Ib. 17.

by the texts, as first written, of the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. The words were not written in either of those MSS. *a prima manu*, but were added by a corrector.¹ Corrector C added *εν εφεσω*.

Again, the existing uncial MSS. read in S. Mt. xiii. 35, *οπως πληρωθη το ρηθεν δια του προφητου λεγοντος Ανοιξω εν παραβολαις κ.τ.λ.* So Stephens, Moscow, the words being of course those of Asaph, Ps. lxxviii. 2. Yet Eusebius states² that there existed in his day the reading *δια ησαιου του προφητου*, although he adds that the accurate copies were without the addition of *δια ησαιου*. S. Jerome states,³ that some MSS. attributed the quotation to Isaiah. Pseudo-Clement, in the 'Homilies,'⁴ has these words: *τω και τον 'Ησαϊον ειπειν Ανοιξω, κ.τ.λ.* Plainly, then, this faulty reading is of a very early date. And this reading the Codex Sinaiticus has; for in that MS. it was written, *a prima manu, δια ησαιου του προφητου*. Five cursive MSS. have this reading, viz. 1, 13, 33, 124, 253. And this, by the way, shows that a later MS. may contain an earlier reading, and is not therefore to be ignored. In his commentary, Tischendorf says, '*ησαιου* : Corrector B deleri voluit.'

Again, the text of Stephens reads in S. John vii. 8, *εγω ουπω αναβαινω εις την εορτην ταυτην*. So the Moscow edition. Yet S. Jerome⁵ states that Porphyry made it an objection, that Jesus having said that He would not go up to the feast, yet did go. 'Iturum se negavit, et fecit quod prius negaverat. latrat Porphyrius: inconstantiae ac mutationis accusat, &c.' The objection was founded on the reading *εγω ουκ αναβαινω, κ.τ.λ.* Now the text of Stephens is supported by the Codex Vaticanus and a considerable majority of the existing uncial MSS. But D, with K and M (two MSS. in the Imperial Library at Paris, about the ninth century), and cursives 17 (2. m.) 33, 389, read *εγω ουκ αναβαινω*. Lo the Codex Sinaiticus comes to the support of the minority (and there is no cor-

¹ It is very doubtful whether the words were not added by l. m. in the Vatican MS.

² Eus. Comm. in Ps. lxxvii. (Tom. I. p. 462, D.E. Montf.), *δια πολων δε προφητου ταυτα ειρητο, η δια του προκειμενου 'Ασάφ' ο μη συνιέντες τινες, προσέθηκαν εν τω εὐαγγελίῳ τὸ, δια 'Ησαίου του προφητου' εν δε τοις ἀκριβέσι ἀντιγράφοις ἀνεν τῆς προσθήκης τῆς δια 'Ησαίου, ἀπλῶς οὕτως εἰρηται' ὅπως, κ.τ.λ.*

³ Jer. in Mt. Cap. 13. Tom. iv. p. 58. "Legi in nonnullis codicibus; et studiosus lector forte reperiet id ipsum, in eo loco ubi nos posuimus, et Vulgata habet Editio: ut impleteretur quod dictum est per Prophetam dicentem, ibi scriptum, per Isaiam Prophetam dicentem. Quod quia minime inveniebatur in Isaiā, arbitror postea a prudentibus viris esse sublatum. Sed mihi videtur in principio ita editum: Quod scriptum est per Asaph Prophetam, dicentem.

⁴ XVIII. XV. pp. 364-5, ed. Dressel.

⁵ II. Dial. adv. Pel. (Tom. iv. P. II. p. 521). Epiphanius and others testify to the same reading.

rection), their reading (be it observed) having been previously adopted by the different editors, Griesbach, Scholz, Tischendorf, Tregelles. Lachmann retains the reading of Stephens.

Again, take S. Lk. vii. 35, we read *καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς πάντων*. So the Moscow edition (except αὐτῆς for αὐτῆς). All the Greek MSS. read *τεκνῶν*, yet S. Ambrose,¹ though he first cites the passage 'ab omnibus filiis suis,' then says, that very many Greek copies read *εργῶν*: and this very reading the Codex Sinaiticus has. Now compare with this the parallel passage in S. Mt. xi. 19, *καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς*, where (B 1. m.) and 124, read *εργῶν* for *τεκνῶν*. Here, too, the Codex Sinaiticus reads *εργῶν*. There is no correction.

Again, in S. John i. 4, the text of Stephens reads *ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν*. So the Moscow edition. D alone of existing uncials and cursives reads *ἐστιν* for *ἦν*. Yet Origen² mentions that some of the copies read *ἐστιν*, and he adds *καὶ τάχα οὐκ ἀπιθάνως*. This reading, already adopted by Lachmann, the Codex Sinaiticus exhibits. There is no correction.

Again, S. John xvii. 7, the text of Stephens reads, *νῦν ἔγνωκαν ὅτι πάντα ὅσα δέδωκάς μοι, παρὰ σοῦ ἐστιν*. So the Moscow edition. The reading, *ἔγνωκαν*, is supported by all the Greek MSS. Yet Chrysostom³ mentions the reading *ἔγνων* for *ἔγνωκαν*: and it is also mentioned in a catena.⁴ This reading, *νῦν ἔγνων*, the Codex Sinaiticus exhibits. There is no correction.

Again, in S. Lk. xi. 4, the text of Stephens has, *ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ*. So the Moscow edition. This is defended by the great majority of uncial MSS., including A, C, D. But B, L, have it not, neither the cursive 1, 22, 57, 130^{ex} et lat., 131, &c. The Codex Sinaiticus again comes to the aid of the minority, and with them supports the text of Tischendorf, in omitting these words from S. Luke's version of our Lord's prayer.⁵

In Heb. ix. 17, the text of Stephens reads, *ἐπεὶ μή ποτε*

¹ Exp. Ev. S. Luc. Lib. vi. 6. Tom i. p. 1385. 'Unde plerique græci sic habent: justificata est sapientia ab omnibus operibus suis; quod opus justitiæ sit, circa uniuscujusque meritum servare mensuram.'

² Origen in Jo. Tom. ii. 13 (Tom. iv. p. 72). *τινὰ μέντοιγε τῶν ἀντεγράφων ἔχει, καὶ τάχα οὐκ ἀπιθάνως, δ' γέγονεν, ἐν αὐτῷ (ζωὴ) ἐστιν*.

In Joann. Hom. lxxxi. (Tom. viii. p. 478), *τινὲς μὲν γὰρ λέγουσιν, ὅτι νῦν ἔγνων ὅτι πάντα ὅσα δέδωκάς μοι παρὰ σοῦ ἐστιν ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι τοῦτο λέγον' πῶς γὰρ ἔμελλεν ἀγορεύειν ὁ υἱὸς τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς;*

³ *τινὲς τὸ ἐπαγγέλλον Νῦν ἔγνων λέγουσιν, ὅτι περὶ αὐτοῦ εἶπεν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι τοῦτο λέγον*.

⁴ *παρασπον: C* addidit ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπο τ (nihil amplius), sed rursus deletiv. Quibus deletis notam post γῆσ (num. 19), addidiæ censendus est.*

γῆσ: C τησ (sed rursus etasum), γῆσ κ ρύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπο του πονηρου.' (Tischendorf in Comm.)*

ισχύει ὅτε ξῆ ὁ διαθέμενος. So the Moscow edition. The Codex Claromontanus alone, of existing Greek MSS., reads, *μη τότε*: but this reading is mentioned by Isidore of Pelusium.¹ Once more the Codex Sinaiticus comes to the aid of the solitary witness, and supports the reading of the Claromontanus. Corrector C altered the reading to *ποτε*.

In S. John xii. 32, the text of Stephens reads, *καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, πάντας ἐλκύσω πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν*. So the Moscow edition; and this is supported by nearly all the Greek MSS. Yet Augustine has remarked upon this text, 'non autem dixit omnes sed omnia:'² and *πάντα* is the reading in D, and in cursive 56. To their aid now comes the Codex Sinaiticus, reading with them, *παντα*. Corrector C^a alters to *παντας*.

In S. Lk. xxiv. 13, Emmaus is described as distant from Jerusalem *σταδίους ἑξήκοντα*. So Stephens, Moscow. Now Jerome and Eusebius³ identify Emmaus with Nicopolis, which was distant from Jerusalem 160 stades; and *σταδίους εκατον ἑξήκοντα* is the reading in some uncial and cursive MSS., besides other authorities. This, too, is the reading in the Codex Sinaiticus. There is no correction.

In S. Mt. xviii. 24, the debtor is described as *ὀφειλέτης μυρίων ταλάντων*. So Stephens, Moscow. All the Greek MSS. support this reading. Yet the Coptic and Sahidic versions imply *πολλων* for *μυριων*, and Origen⁴ six times quotes the text with *πολλων*: and *πολλων* is the reading in the Codex Sinaiticus. Corrector C^a substitutes *μυριων*.

In S. John xiii. 10, the text of Stephens reads, 'Ὁ λελουμένος οὐ χρείαν ἔχει ἢ τοὺς πόδας νίψασθαι'. So Moscow. Some Latin MSS., and Origen⁵ six times, omit the words *η τους ποδας*. The Codex Sinaiticus alone, of Greek MSS., reads *οὐκ ἐχει χρείαν νίψασθαι*. C^a corrects *ἐχει*.

In Rom. v. 7, the Codex Sinaiticus alone, with Origen⁶

¹ Epist. iv. 113 (p. 56), . . ἀντεπιστέλλω, ὅτι τὸ μή ποτε τότε ἐστὶ, μίᾳ κεραίᾳ ἐν στοιχείῳ, ὑπὸ τινων ἰσως ἀμαθῶς προστεθείσης· οὕτω γὰρ εἶρον καὶ ἐν παλαιοῖς ἀντιγράφοις.

² The Vulgate, with many MSS. and authorities, has *omnia*.

³ Eusebius, Onomast., αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ Νικόπολις τῆς Παλαιστίνης ἐπίσημος πόλις.

Jerome, Catal. Sc. Eccl. lxiii.; Tom. iv. Pt. II. p. 118. Julius Africanus . . . legationem pro instauratione urbis Emmaus suscepit, quæ postea Nicopolis appellata est.

⁴ In Mt., Tom. xiv. 9. (Tom. iii. 627.) Μετὰ ταῦτα λεκτέον εἰς τὸ ἀρξαμένου δι' αὐτοῦ συναρῆναι λόγον, προσήχθη αὐτῷ εἰς ὀφειλέτης πολλῶν ταλάντων.

⁵ Origen, however, does acknowledge the *η τους ποδας*. For in quoting the whole passage on which to found his comment, he reads, *ὁ λελουμένος οὐκ ἐχει χρείαν εἰ μὴ τοὺς πόδας νίψασθαι, ἀλλ' ἐστι καθαρὸς ὅλος*: in Jo. Tom. xxxii. 4. (Tom. iv. p. 411.) Afterwards, in the course of his commentary, he quotes, *ὁ γὰρ λελουμένος οὐκ ἐχει χρείαν νίψασθαι ἀλλ' ἐστι καθαρὸς ὅλος*. Ibid. 6 (p. 418).

⁶ Or. cont. Celsum, iv. 28. (Tom. i. p. 521 d.) καὶ τοῖ γε μόγις τις ὑπὲρ τοῦ δικαίου ἀποθανέϊται.

alone, reads *μογισ* for *μολις*. Corrector A writes *λ* over the *γ*.

In S. Mt. vii. 13, the text of Stephens reads, *ὅτι πλατεία ἡ πύλη, καὶ εὐρύχωρος ἡ ὁδὸς κ.τ.λ.* And so the Moscow edition, supported by all the Greek MSS.: but the most ancient Latin MSS. omit *η πύλη*, and the frequent allusions of Clement and Origen¹ indicate the omission. The Codex Sinaiticus, a *prima manu*, omits *η πύλη*, as Lachmann in his edition has done. *οτι πλατια και ευρυχωρος η οδος*. After *πλατια* Corrector B adds *η πύλη*.

In 2 Pet. i. 4, the text of Stephens reads *ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς*. So the Moscow edition. We find in S. Jerome² 'fugientes eam quæ in mundo est concupiscentiam corruptionis.' The Codex Sinaiticus alone, of Greek MSS., reads *την εν τω κοσμῳ επιθυμιαν φθορας*. There is no correction.

In S. John xix. 38, the text of Stephens reads *ἦλθεν οὖν καὶ ἦρε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*. So the Moscow edition. All the Greek MSS. here give the verbs in the singular: but the most ancient Latin MSS.³ with the Sahidic and the Jerusalem Syriac versions, give the verbs in the plural: so, too, the Codex Sinaiticus, *ἦλθον ουν και ηραν αυτον*. Corrector C^a reads *ἦλθεν* and *ἤρεν το σῶμα αυτου*.

In S. Mk. i. 15, the words *καὶ λεγων* are omitted by two Latin MSS.⁴ and by Origen: they are also omitted by the Codex Sinaiticus. Corrector A seems to have written *λεγων* over *οτι*.

In S. Lk. vi. 35, the text of Stephens reads, *καὶ δανειζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες*. So the Moscow edition; and *μηδεν* is supported by all the Greek MSS. Yet all the Syriac versions, and one Arabic edition, render as though *μηδεν* were the reading, and *μηδεν* *απελπιζοντες* is the reading in the Codex Sinaiticus. There is no correction.

In S. Mk. vii. 3, the text of Stephens reads, *ἐὰν μὴ πυγμῇ νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας*. So the Moscow edition. So read nearly all the Greek MSS. D alone reading *πυκμη*, and Δ omitting the word. Yet the Coptic, Gothic, later Syriac, and some Latin MSS.,⁵ render as though *πυκνα* were the reading; and *πυκνα* does appear in the Codex Sinaiticus, and (of Greek MSS.) in that alone. There is no correction.

¹ Clem. Al. Strom., iv. 487 (p. 578). *πλατεία καὶ εὐρύχωρος ὁδὸς ἀπάγει εἰς τὴν ἀπάλειαν κ.τ.λ.* Orig. Selecta in Ps. cxviii. (= cxix.), 32. (Tom. ii. p. 800.) οὕτω μὲν ἡ πλατεία καὶ εὐρύχωρος ὁδὸς ἀπάγει εἰς τὴν ἀπάλειαν.

² Adv. Jovin. i. (Tom. iv., P. II., p. 182.)

³ E.g. MS. Corb. ap. Sabatier. Venerunt ergo et tulerunt eum.

⁴ One is the Codex Aureus S. Mart. Turon.—Orig. in Jo. Tom. x. 1. (Tom. iv. p. 161, D.) ὁ δὲ Μάρκος . . . κηρύσσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι πεπληρωται, κ.τ.λ.

⁵ Crebro lavent, S. Germ. 1. 2. S. Mart. Turon. ap. Sab.

In S. John vi. 51, the text of Stephens reads, *καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν, ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς*. So the Moscow edition. The words, *ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω*, are omitted by B, C, D, L, T, but the words *ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς*, stand in the Greek MSS. as in the ordinary text. One Latin MS., however (*m*), reads, 'hic panis quem ego dabo pro hujus mundi vita corpus meum est;' and Tertullian¹ quotes the passage as 'et panis quem ego dederō pro salute mundi caro mea est;' and with Tertullian, the Codex Sinaiticus alone, of Greek MSS., agrees. *ο ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν*. The only correction here, is *καὶ* prefixed to *ο ἄρτος* by C^a.

In S. John ii. 3, the text of Stephens has, *καὶ ὑστερήσαντος οἴνου, λέγει ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν, Οἶνον οὐκ ἔχουσι*. So the Moscow edition. For *καὶ υσ. οιν.* two Latin versions have, 'et factum est per multam turbam vocitorum vinum consummari;' MS. Corb. (ap. Sabatier) have, 'et vinum non habebant, quoniam consummatum erat vinum nuptiarum.' With this latter agrees the Æthiopic version. Now the Codex Sinaiticus alone, of Greek MSS., reads *καὶ υστερησαντος οἴνου ἐλεσθῇ ο οἶνος του γαμου εἰτα* λέγει κ.τ.λ. So the passage stands in the printed text.²

One instance cited by Professor Tischendorf does, indeed, puzzle us. He says in his prolegomena, that the Codex Sinaiticus agrees with the Codex Bezae and Origen, in reading *καὶ εἰς βηθανίαν*, at S. Mk. xi. 1. It is quite true that Origen calls attention to the reading, *Ἰδωμεν δὲ περὶ τῆς Βηθφαγῆ μὲν κατὰ Ματθαῖον, Βηθανίας δὲ κατὰ τὸν Μάρκον, Βηθφαγῆ δὲ καὶ Βηθανίας κατὰ τὸν Λουκᾶν*, Comm. in Mt. Tom. xvi. 17 (Tom. iii. p. 743). Yet the printed text of the Sinaitic has *εἰς βηθφαγῆ καὶ εἰς βηθανίαν* (!).

There is much more evidence of a similar kind to be obtained, by comparing the readings of the Codex Sinaiticus with the peculiar readings of the older uncial MSS., such, for instance, as the Codex Vaticanus, the Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, the Codex Bezae.³ This evidence is, however, similar in

¹ De Carn. Chr. p. 549, c. (ap. Sabatier).

² In his note the Professor says, 'Primum ita scriptum erat: *καὶ οἱ—οἶνον οὐκ ἔχον ο—τι συνετελεσθῇ—ο οἶνος του γαμου—εἰτα λέγει*. Verbis *οἶνον ο.ε.ο. συνετε* omni cum cura sublati proptereaue lectu difficilissimis *υστερησ. οἶνου* repositum est: quæ reliqua sunt, *ἐλεσθῇ usque εἰτα*, uncis inclusa, a C^a etiam punctis notata sunt. Antiquissimam vero scripturam non tam ipse scriptor mutasse censendus est quam A, et formis et atramento primam manum tantum non adæquans.'

³ Number of readings peculiar to *κ* and one other MS. About 87 *κ* B.

31 *κ* D.

7 *κ* L.

1 *κ* Z.

2 *κ* C.

11 or 12 *κ* A.

kind to that which has been already exhibited; although, of course, it is obvious that the more such evidence can be accumulated, the stronger becomes the argument in favour of the genuineness and antiquity of the MS. To discuss all that has lately appeared in the papers on this subject would require an article by itself; nor do we know that, at the present stage of the controversy, anything absolutely decisive can be affirmed. There may be a strong *feeling* as to which side is right; still it must also be admitted that there are some difficulties on both sides, which require explanation. We will, however, take the latest statement of Dr. Simonides, and will then proceed to point out certain difficulties, which we may fairly call upon Dr. Simonides to explain.

In his letter to the *Guardian* newspaper, Jan. 21, 1863, he says: 'But because some observations of the frivolous defenders of the pseudo-Sinaitic Codex would fain lead us to believe that I contemplated receding from my statement respecting the genuineness of the manuscript, I am obliged to say briefly the following, particularly in reply to Mr. W. A. Wright.

'First, that my uncle Benedict, being by profession a theologian, and versed in twelve languages, intending to publish both the Old and New Testaments, and the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, with exegetic scholia of the ancient commentators, and specially to reply to what had been written against the Septuagint, began this work while Professor in the College of Cydon, in the year 1784. Having removed to Mount Athos in 1819, for the sake of retirement, and embraced the monastic life in the Monastery of Esphigmenos, he was named Benedict (for surely they who adopt the monastic life ought to change themselves and their names as well as their lives), having formerly had two names, Basilaeus and Bessarion. While at Athos he gave himself up particularly to the study of the Sacred Scriptures. He collected the most ancient MSS. of both Testaments, and of their commentators, and at considerable expense prepared his work for the press. The Greek Revolution interfered: he withdrew after a little time to the island of Hydra, thence to Cythera, thence to Petzaris, and finally to Calaurra, now Paros, where there is a famous monastery of the Virgin, in which he remained a long time, teaching theology to twelve Greek youths, by command of Capo D'Istrias, Governor of Greece. After the assassination of the Governor, he again removed to Mount Athos, where he continued until his death. I was then sojourning at Ægina, and thence set out to Nauplia, thence to Syme, Syra, back to Ægina, and other places. I also visited Mount Athos in 1837, in which year the discovery of the library took place. I

‘ remained fourteen months at Mount Athos, increasing my
‘ theological knowledge under my uncle, at the same time study-
‘ ing, scientifically, palæography and archæology.

‘ When I say scientifically, I do not mean what Mr. Wright
‘ understands, but what he does not comprehend, and concerning
‘ which he is silent.

‘ I was taught the means of knowing the ancient MSS. of
‘ every period and of every nation, their changes from time, also
‘ the knowledge of the skins, and the chemical preparation of
‘ the different writing-inks, and the effects of the atmospheric
‘ changes of the different climates of the world. Further, I
‘ acquired the knowledge of the preparation of the skins of
‘ every city of the ancient nations, and such other information
‘ as is requisite with regard to the indisputable evidence both of
‘ the spuriousness and genuineness of MSS. of every kind;
‘ which information, it is to be regretted, is not possessed by any
‘ of the archæologists and palæographers of our day, as I was
‘ sufficiently assured by many circumstances, first and last, and
‘ more especially lately, when the pseudo-Sinaitic Codex ap-
‘ peared.

‘ The discovery of the above-mentioned library induced my
‘ uncle to establish a printing-press at Athos, for the dissemina-
‘ tion of the various unpublished MSS., and those which he was
‘ preparing for publication.

‘ For this purpose I was urged by him to go to Athens, and
‘ provide there everything requisite for printing. I went, and
‘ placed myself under the direction of A. Caromela for a suffi-
‘ cient time, he being then the first printer in Athens, and on
‘ this account also some spoke disrespectfully of me. I wrote
‘ to my uncle from Athens duly, that it was impossible for any
‘ one to obtain a proper printing-press in Greece, because the
‘ Greeks themselves procured from France every requisite for
‘ printing. Being assured of this by others also, he recalled me
‘ to Athos. I sailed from the Piræus in the month of Novem-
‘ ber, 1839, and landed again at Athos for the fifth time. After
‘ a few days I undertook the task of transcribing the *Codex*, the
‘ text of which, as I remarked before, had many years previously
‘ been prepared for another purpose. But Benedict, as well as
‘ the principals of the monastery, wishing to recognise with
‘ gratitude the munificence of the Emperor Nicholas on the one
‘ hand, and desiring on the other to acquire a printing-press
‘ without expense, and being unable otherwise to effect these
‘ purposes, decided that a transcript of the Sacred Scriptures
‘ should be made in the ancient style, and presented as a gift to
‘ the Emperor Nicholas, and he found that all the heads of the
‘ monastery perfectly agreed with him. Accordingly, having

‘ again revised the books ready for publication, and, first Genesis, he gave it to me to transcribe.

‘ But you need not such examples, for they abound in ancient and modern history. Knowing this, I say to you again, that the MS. of the Sacred Scriptures taken from Mount Sinai by Tischendorf, is my production, and by no means ancient.

‘ The Codex proclaims this itself, as shall be afterwards shown, when my proofs will speak for themselves. Words are therefore needless.

‘ Truly I wonder how people can credit such unreasonable falsehoods, things wholly impossible, and believe the reports of Tischendorf—viz., that I prepared palimpsests, and wrote 10,000 pages of an Egyptian Lexicon, 7,000 pages of the Alexandrine Philological Catalogue, 10,000 pages of Uranius! 8,800,000 pages of various other ancient writers on different subjects! That I corrected the corrupted texts of various classical writers, filled up many blanks of injured ancient MSS., and wrote and prepared papyri! And all this in a very limited space of time, for which work a life of two thousand years would not suffice me, had I two thousand hands, and one thousand [heads?]. Yet they consider it a wonder to have made a simple copy of a manuscript of the Old and New Testaments, done by me in my juvenile years. O wonder of wonders!

‘ You prepared yourself, my dear Sir, for the defence of the Sinaitic Codex, by swallowing indiscriminately all the falsehoods concerning its discovery, told by your famous Tischendorf. But what scientific proofs have you to confirm its genuineness? Certainly none: neither do I expect such from you nor from your friend Tischendorf, for neither you nor he possess the true knowledge of Palæographical Science. You have only learned to say at random, this is genuine, and this is spurious, but you do not know the reason. But although I possess many proofs of the spuriousness of the manuscript, I shall keep silent on these for the present. First, because I intend to write a special work on the subject, and secondly, because the Codex will prove this itself when published, and the portion already published partly shows this, and if you understood the twofold signification of the note which exists at the end of the fourth column of the eighth page of the pseudo-Frederico-Augustine Codex, you would repent of what both you and your patrons have stirred up against me inconsiderately.’

According to this letter then, Benedict (who in a former letter is styled of blessed memory) prepared an edition of the LXX. and New Testament, Simonides made the transcript, and this transcript, written about A.D. 1840, is—the Codex Sinaiticus.

But here we encounter serious difficulties. Professor Tischendorf states that there are many letters in the marginal notes which have been lost, from their having been written close up to the edge, and from the further circumstance of the edges having suffered injury. Now this is a thing which is extremely likely to happen with a MS. some centuries old, but is it likely to be the case with a MS. written on parchment (or vellum), and not much more than twenty years old? We assume that Professor Tischendorf's statement is correct, for the point is one upon which he could hardly be deceived; if his statement be not correct, then, indeed, his authority can go for very little.

We would next ask, Were the blank parchment-leaves on which Dr. Simonides states he wrote this MS., previously arranged in quaternions, or did he so arrange them? If so, how came the quaternions, originally written in red ink at the top of the page, to disappear? And when did he write the present numbers of the quaternions at the right-hand top-corners of the pages? And how does he account for the difference of numbering in the old and new quaternions already mentioned? If the manuscript be his manufacture, this is a matter which he can in a moment explain. Again, Why was the page-title in the Revelation, which in the earlier pages was *αποκαλυψις*, altered in the later pages to *αποκαλυψεις*?

Are the worm-eaten holes *through* the letters, or do the letters *avoid* the holes?

As to the ink or inks:—So accomplished a *τεχνητής καλλιγράφος* may possibly have a small basket of differently tinted inks,¹ as we sometimes see a small basket containing different kinds of fish-sauce handed round at dinner: and such an apparatus would be most convenient, or indeed necessary, if the object was to *forge* a MS. resembling an old one: but what purpose could these inks of varied hue answer, when the object was simply to transcribe the edition of a learned and revered uncle? and that to lay before the feet of an Emperor?

Whether there is the difference which Professor Tischendorf states, between the handwritings of the original scribes, is a point which must be determined by inspection of the actual MS. He himself states that the handwritings have points of resemblance. If skilful palæographers, after a careful examination of the MS., decide that, in their judgment, four different, though contemporaneous hands, were set on to write the original document, this is a further point for Dr. Simonides to explain. How comes his handwriting to present the appearance of four different handwritings? It may be observed that the hypothesis of

¹ *E.g.* fuscum, cineraceum, fulvum, e fusco rutilans, pullum, minium, luridum, nigerrimum. According to Tischendorf, all these tints occur in the Codex.

Tischendorf is favoured by a somewhat similar instance in the Ephraem Rescript, in which he considers the Old and New Testament fragments to be written by different hands. But if it be decided that Professor Tischendorf is mistaken, this must of course diminish our confidence in his judgment, and (as far as it goes) makes for the side of Dr. Simonides.

A further point to be decided, after inspection of the MS., is, Are the correctors so numerous as Professor Tischendorf supposes? or has he been over-fine in his discrimination? We know that he has distinguished two different correctors in the Ephraem Rescript, and eleven different correctors in the Codex Claromontanus. These distinctions have hitherto, as we believe, passed without challenge. The same may be the case with the Codex Sinaiticus. It will be for Dr. Simonides to explain, if he made all these corrections, why they present such different appearances, as to induce a practised judge, like Professor Tischendorf, to conclude that they belong to different hands who wrote centuries apart. A professional *artiste*, wishing to *forge* a quasi-ancient MS., might be able to execute so many different handwritings; but then he does it (if he can do it) with intention to deceive. It is for Dr. Simonides to explain why, if he found it necessary to correct his own transcript of his uncle's edition, he should have made his corrections in so many different forms, and of so many different hues. If, on the other hand, competent judges decide that Professor Tischendorf is mistaken about this host of correctors, this will much shake our confidence in his conclusions with regard not only to the Codex Sinaiticus, but to other similar editions, about which he has laboured, certainly, with no small assiduity, as, for instance, the Codex Claromontanus.

The fluctuation between two readings, or the blending of two readings, might perhaps happen in a recently-prepared MS., which was afterwards corrected from other MSS., although this is a matter which seems to belong rather to a time when scribes often knew very little about what they were writing, than to the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries.

Can Dr. Simonides favour us with any information about Theophylact, Dionysius, and Hilarion, whose names occur in the Codex Sinaiticus? or have the names been inscribed since the parchments passed out of his keeping? or are the triad men of straw? or *noms de guerre*? Who are Antoninus and Pamphilus, mentioned in the note in the Codex Friderico-Augustanus? Can Dr. Simonides explain why the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas appear in his uncle's edition, as if they were part of the *New Testament*? The photo-lithographed plate represents the Epistle of Barnabas commencing in the

very next column to that in which the Apocalypse ends, just as S. Luke follows S. Mark. Such an arrangement might have been not unusual in the centuries when the Canon of the New Testament was not fixed by common consent among the churches. A case exactly in point occurs in our own Alexandrine MS., where the two epistles called *Κλημεντος α*, and *Κλημεντος β*, are found expressly mentioned, in the catalogue, as part of the New Testament. But what editor of the New Testament, in the present day, would think of putting forth an edition with the epistles of Barnabas and Clement to appear as a part of the sacred text? The Moscow edition of the New Testament ends with the Apocalypse.

How comes it that the Codex Sinaiticus is full of *itacisms*, inasmuch that a collation, which takes note of all these, is a most laborious affair? Did Benedict blindly copy these from ancient MSS.? Why should they be retained in a modern edition, to be offered as a present to the Emperor? Why are some corrected, others not so?¹

Dr. Simonides may be fairly called upon to explain, how it comes to pass that his uncle's edition so often agrees with the readings which are found in the Codex Vaticanus alone? Mai's first edition of that venerable witness was not published till 1857; the text of the Vatican was only known from the partial and frequently faulty collations of Bartolucci (still unprinted), of Mico for Bentley, of Birch. Had Benedict these collations at hand? Can Simonides explain why his uncle chose to adopt the reading of the Vatican MS., even where it is manifestly in error?² What made Benedict so enamoured of the Codex Bezae, as to adopt some of its readings where it stands alone? What made Benedict adopt into his recension of the New Testament readings which exist in no Greek MS. at present known, and which are only found, as it were, in fossil, petrified in some version, or in the writings of a Latin Father? Would any editor adopt, into the text of the New Testament, a reading existing only in Latin, on the authority of only one writer? He might, indeed, believe the reading to be the true one; but surely, on so slender a basis, he would hardly venture to adopt it into his text. Would a *Greek* editor be likely to adopt a reading on the sole authority of a *Latin* Version or a *Latin* Father? Yet this is what, according to Dr. Simonides, his

¹ Eg. in one column of Isaiah (lxii. 11, *sqq.*) occur *καλεσι* (corrected), *καταλελμμενη* (uncorrected), *παπαγεινομενος* (uncorrected), *αρεος* (uncorrected), *διαλεγομε* (corrected), *ουδις* (corrected).

² Eg. Mark iv. 8. α and β both read *αυξανόμενα* (uncorrected in α).

21.	"	"	υπο λυχνιαν (uncorrected in α.)
2 Pet. ii. 13.	"	"	αδικουμενοι for κομιουμενοι (corrected by
			Corrector C to κομιουμενοι).

uncle Benedict has done. If that learned theologian were still alive, we would ask Dr. Simonides to tell all this to his uncle. But as Benedict has quitted the scene of his editorial labours, we would ask Dr. Simonides to inform us, whether his uncle has left behind him anything more substantial than that memory, over which the nephew lingers with a natural and pious affection? Where is the original document from which Dr. Simonides made his transcript? Where are the MSS.? what are the materials from which Benedict framed his recension?

These are questions which must be answered satisfactorily before we can believe in this *Benedictine Edition* of the Septuagint and New Testament. We therefore wait for those further proofs which Dr. Simonides for the present reserves.

Once more. The Codex Friderico-Augustanus is part and parcel of the Codex Sinaiticus. It was published in 1846. Why was Dr. Simonides silent about its real authorship till the Codex Sinaiticus became known, in 1860?

We must confess that, as far as we have yet gone in this matter, the weight of evidence appears to us to be almost all on one side; on the other side is little more than assertion, reiterated, indeed, but not (at present) supported by proof. Dr. Simonides reserves his proofs. It seems he is writing a book on the subject. Of course he cannot expect us to give weight to his proofs till we know of what kind they are. There is however one comfort: if, in spite of the difficulties we have mentioned, he succeed in making good his statement, then we shall have in this transcript (if it be so), a treasure not much inferior to the Codex itself, supposing it to be genuine; for the edition of Benedict must give us the clue to the materials from which he framed his marvellous recension.

If, on the other hand, it turns out that the Codex is genuine, and that its age has been rightly estimated, we shall, indeed, have cause to be most thankful. For, not to mention the important sections of the Septuagint, the epistle of Barnabas, and the fragment of Hermas, we have the New Testament complete *from end to end*. With no other known uncial MS. is this the case. The Alexandrine MS. and the Ephraem Rescript were complete once: alas! they are so no longer. The Codex Sinaiticus exhibits the Four Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, the Acts, the Catholic Epistles, the Apocalypse, *substantially* just the same as the Church has for centuries received them, its very variations from the received text (where it does vary) been often so many marks of its antiquity. 'Ipsi remotissimæ antiquitatis viri, venerebiles quum orientis tum occidentis patres surgunt testes, suæ ætatis homines arcana sanctarum litterarum ex voluminibus hausisse hujus simillimis.'¹ If the MS. was written about

¹ Tischendorf in the Dedication.

A.D. 350, S. Ambrose may have seen it; S. Basil may have seen it: if it was written a few years earlier, Eusebius himself may have had it transcribed, and Constantine may have presented it to some Church.

But the question must really be decided by a critical examination of the document itself, made by expert palæographers. The sooner Professor Tischendorf can have this done, the better will it be for his own credit as a palæographer, and, we will add, the more will it forward the sale of those copies, the disposal of which has been left in his hands. Whether the examination is made in Germany, France, or England, matters but little, so long as competent persons conduct it. Only let it be done at once.

NOTE.—We subjoin a few particulars likely to be of interest:—

The Codex has Luke xxii. 43, 44, *ωφθη—γην*. 1 m. Corrector A omits the passage, Corrector C restores it.

John v. 1. The Codex reads *η εορτη*.

„ — 3, 4. *εκδεχομενων—νοσηματι* is omitted.

John vii. 53. *και εκορευθη* to viii. 11, *αμαρτανε* is omitted.

Acts viii. 37. *ειπε—χριστον* is omitted.

Acts xx. 28. The Codex reads *την εκκλησιαν του θυ*.

The passage in 1 John v. 6—8, stands thus:—

αλη.
 θεια οτι οι τρεις ει
 σιν οι μαρτυροῦ
 τεσ το πνα και του
 δωρ και το αιμα
 και οι τρεις εισ το
 εν εισιν ει την μαρ.

In 1 Tim. iii. 16, 1 m. wrote *ος*, which was altered to *θεος* by a very late corrector.

Mt. xxiii. 35. The words *νιου βαραχιον* are omitted a 1 m.; but were added by corrector C^b.

Mt. xxviii. 9, *ωσδε εκορευοντο απαγγελιαι τος μαθηταις αυτου*; omitted. No correction.

ART. VII.—*Salem Chapel.* Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh.

PERHAPS the Voluntary System has arrived, in our day, at the point where it may fitly be treated by a female pen: that is, Dissent has come out long enough and far enough from that acknowledged period of early enthusiasm, when an idea overmastered the individual bent and temperament of its professors, imparting a common likeness to them all, and has settled into a fact, but no longer the most prominent fact, about the dissentient. The Nonconformist of our time is subject to no strong exceptional stimulant: he is left, undisturbed from without, to the influence of ordinary human motives. It cannot be denied that Dissent is now an institution: thus Dissenters have lost both the sense of isolation and of being a mark for the observation of a peculiarly exacting public opinion. Anything like a distinct and formal religious profession makes the world look for something separate and unusual in the conduct; but when a man once treads in his father's and grandfather's steps, whatever direction these take him to, men do not look for anything very distinctive in the gait. It was no credit to the Church that Dissenters were expected, as such, to be stricter in their walk than Church-people; but no doubt such used to be the case, because each individual Dissenter was thought to be consciously separating himself from the practices of ordinary society. If we had a class of deaconesses in our Church, as is proposed, the world, and probably each one of us, would for some time expect them to be much more austere separate from the habits of ordinary society than is now looked for from deacons; but the sisterhood being established long enough, the same law, in the course of years, would be seen to apply to both sexes. In the same way, when Nonconformity was young, everybody—meaning by everybody people who do not speculate and reason for themselves, but follow blindly the world's assumption of what is fitting—required an ultra strictness of consistency to their profession from Dissenters; or why did they dissent?—an expectation the flattering austerity of which has relaxed under the inevitable effects of time and use: so that the world may be said now to hold Dissenters under no stricter ties than Churchmen. It is no longer scandalized or amazed to hear of young Congregationalists dancing, and would scarcely think twice of a family party of them being seen at Lord Dundreary's. No one will dispute that the three denominations, except for a few formulas of separation,

have thrown aside the manners and pretensions of a severe exclusiveness. Now, instead of withdrawing themselves from general society, their complaint and grievance—generally nourished, if not always expressed—is, that they are excluded from it, that society is repellant to them; a charge which, so far as there is truth in it, has very little concern with the religious aspect of the question.

When sectarian aspirations blend with social, and the religious element is more than coloured by the political, when Dissent is recognised as an institution and is subject to the influences of all large mixed communities, it shares the tendencies which Dissenters have hitherto ascribed to a state religion; Dissent is in fact established so far as the world's recognition can make it so. People are born into it, and have been for generations enough to lose the original sense of being separatists. With the majority, their first ideas have been of belonging to a recognised body, with its own rights and position. In most cases they are without that sense of isolation, active antagonism, and estrangement from the Church, which embittered their forefathers.

People's formal belief, their religious education, the nature of the services in which they join, the language of prayer and of preaching, affects, beyond most influences, their tone of thought, and through that the manner, even where the inner feelings are not deeply impressed, nor the life regulated by them. And born and bred thus, passive Dissenters cannot escape the tone of thought and the manner of their party being evident in their social manifestation of themselves, though their common citizenship may be most prominent to themselves, and, what they would wish, the one thing acknowledged by the world. A large, compact, influential body has a language and a way of seeing things of its own, and is, in fact, its own world, though there may be another outer one, the object of vague desire. It is at this stage that Dissent, as we have said, becomes a theme for the female pen. So long as a man's profession is powerful enough to bend the feelings and will to strict external accordance with its dictates—so long as he is an impersonation of his creed—he is an especial subject for masculine sympathy, or, at least, comprehension. A man enters most easily into the fervour of polemics and the absorbing interest of controversy, not to say that his intellect best fits him for nice distinctions, for the subtleties of argument, and for theology as a science; but a woman, if she be quick-witted and observant, at least equals him in detecting private motives under the veil of public ones, in unmasking the real homely influences at work under a lofty assumption, in reducing a pompous show to its frippery component parts. No woman could have delineated David Deans, who had not only

every knotty question of Presbyterianism at his fingers' ends, but let them control every private interest; who at once comprehended and acted up to his principles; but it seems to us that a man could not have surpassed the authoress of the present work in her picture of a deacon under the Voluntary System of our own time. Tozer is as correct a portrait of Dissent, as it is, as the old Scotchman was of the Covenanters in their sternest consistency. We want no more graphic pencil than that which brings before us Salem Chapel, its minister, 'office-bearers,' and congregation: all the sharply-defined distinctness of sect worn off with time, and mere common homely human nature cropping out instead. It may not be, and we dare say is not, the whole truth, but it is truth as far as it goes, and as much of it as most delineators of human character can take in for their own share. We know what exposures of all kinds are worth: anything can be proved, any system convicted, by a novelist who, with temper embittered, avenges himself on a system for wrongs or fancied wrongs. We have read autobiographies which, if they expose a party or denomination, expose the character and disposition of the writer much more. But this is not an exposure, nor, we believe, undertaken with that view; it is simply, as we suppose, a reproduction, for the interest and amusement of the reader, of certain scenes and characters, which, modified and disguised, perhaps, but essentially the same, once occupied a great deal of the writer's thoughts and interests. We suspect literary ladies are beginning to find that a good deal of that particular sort of experience through which their own minds have been trained—but which they had hitherto treated as too familiar, common, and unromantic, to be available as literary stock—is a vein of purer metal than any they have yet sought into. By renouncing deliberate invention, and digging into memory and association, something fresher, more attractive, and in a sense original—that is, newer and more real to the reader, and characteristic of the writer—may be brought to light than anything fancy and effort at novelty can achieve. The discovery has its dangers, but it is through it that we have such characters as George Eliot's Mrs. Poyser, the M. Paul of Villette, the ladies of Crawford, and, let us add, from another school altogether, Miss Yonge's late most spirited and charming delineation, Countess Kate. It is, in fact, evidence of that rarest of all faculties—quick, comprehensive, correct, retentive, seeing—without which all other faculties are imperfect, and make mistakes.

An intentional exposure is always done in bitterness of spirit, whether rightly induced or not; but there is no bitterness in these pages. We do not guess the writer to have suffered in her own person, nor very keenly for others, from the state

of things she so ably sets before us, and shows to belong almost necessarily to a system of Church government which makes the flock master of the shepherd. Through whatever means she has acquired her knowledge and opinions, she has learnt as a keen observer, not as an actor; her personal feelings engaged, not for herself, but for her friends. A name has been popularly attached to this work, a name which has been given on apparently good authority to books so various in tone and style, and differing so entirely in literary merit, as fairly to puzzle the reader: but to us it is a mere name, and tells nothing. We are left to guess, as much as though it were anonymous, under what circumstances a writer so very free from sectarian tone should have acquired her intimate knowledge of Dissenting life—how this pure, expressive, and graceful style should have formed itself under auspices not usually friendly to such an accomplishment. Anything is probable rather than that the delineator of 'our connexion' at Carlingford, should have come at her knowledge second hand, and not upon an intimate personal stand of observation.

People who live, and have always lived, outside Dissent do not make heroes of Dissenting ministers, though the pride of Homer-ton; and though they be 'white-browed and white-handed' into the bargain. It is not fair perhaps. There is no inexorable reason why a hero of romance should not come out of a Congregational college; why, after duly supplying, during his novitiate, the Shilohs and Bethesdas of the neighbourhood, he should not possess an air of the fine gentleman, which shall make him pass muster with fine ladies; but the notion would scarcely come into any person's mind who had not at one time taken a poetical view of the Dissenting pastorate, and had not actually believed in the lofty eloquence—fervid, yet chastened by a correct taste—of some star of Nonconformity. The story shows a sympathy too keen and real for the difficulties and irritations of a clever mind, over-educated and too refined for the work expected from it, to come from anything but an actual knowledge of the position of Congregational pastors. It is no lukewarm partisanship such as any one might feel in realizing the situation: the picture is drawn throughout from the minister's point of view. We have to make allowances, and, while convinced of the correctness of the representation, to remember that Mrs. Tozer's or Mrs. Pigeon's advocate, equally gifted, might make out a counter case, and show up the minister and the minister's wife.

But no true delineation of human nature can be a harsh one. It is a work that softens the temper even in the doing; and this writer is by nature amiable. She just shadows out a villain, to bring about the melodramatic situations of her tale, but there

is something positively genial in her real characters, even those who inflict the keenest suffering on the sensitive young minister. The story gives 'The Interest' a decided lift in social consideration: for, if the *élite* of Homerton look down on the hospitalities of the Pigeons and the Browns, we suspect not a few of our own ministry from St. Aidan's and St. Bees would feel themselves very well off, as well as most at their ease, in scenes here described; whether at the gay profuse tea-parties of the connexion, where we acquire so lively an idea of the wealth and pretensions of its members, or partaking of the more homely hospitality of the back parlour, where, either at dinner or supper, there is always something comfortable, and with housewifery pride it can be said, that 'Tozer and me cannot be took wrong.'

All that the story professes to show is, that Voluntaryism is intolerable to a man of genius, or one who thinks himself such; and that in educating their pastors to a higher point, which is the aim of their leaders—as, for example, Angel James and Mr. Sortain—Dissenters are creating for themselves a ministry incapacitated, by the very polish and ambition thus infused, for the requirements of their flocks. Clever young men, we are given to understand, will not endure the bondage of a subservience from which, as paid servants of the congregation, they cannot free themselves: this is obvious enough; yet we cannot pity their position without tempering our own sympathy with the reflection, that these same clever young men seem becoming a general crux, and that not only in 'the connexion,' but universally. The tendency of the whole class is to reject the work of the world, such as it comes before them to do, as something beneath the notice of their large views and comprehensive grasp of thought.

As perhaps a representative clever young man, we do not find ourselves caring much for this lady's hero, Arthur Vincent. Not at all on the old-fashioned ground, because he is a Dissenting minister, for she desires to divest him of every conventional feature of the class; and her line is so entirely to trace all public action to latent private feeling, that neither our principles nor prejudices are ever roused to assert themselves. His place is a mere accident. We are to think of him as a man acting on merely natural impulses. We are to recognise ourselves in him. If he denounces Church and State, *we* know that he, in fact, cares very little about the matter, that wounded love and disappointed pride are the prompters. Always he is guided, unconsciously to himself, by some motive with which points of doctrine or Church discipline have nothing to do. He would be more worth caring for, in our judgment, if he excited our polemical rancour a little more. But our authoress does not meddle with doctrine—wisely, no doubt—but, perhaps, it is too

clear that the reticence has cost her nothing, and that, for her part, every sermon is interesting, and she has evidently listened to a great many—not so much for what it teaches, but for the insight it gives into the preacher's own character and circumstances. We have, in the following passage, her view of the influences which moved, not only her hero, but which tell with most weight upon Dissent generally:—

‘The events above narrated were all prefatory of the great success accomplished by Mr. Vincent in Carlingford. Indeed, the date of the young minister's fame—fame which, as everybody acquainted with that town must be aware, was wisely diffused beyond Carlingford itself, and even reached the metropolis, and gladdened his *Alma Mater* at Homerton—might almost be fixed by a reference to Lady Western's housekeeping book, if she kept any, and the date of her last summer-party. That event threw the young Nonconformist into just the state of mind which was wanted to quicken all the prejudices of his education, and give individual force to all the hereditary limits of thought in which he had been born. An attempt on the part of the Government to repeal the Toleration Act, or reinstate the Test, could scarcely have produced a more permanent and rapid effect than Lady Western's neglect, and the total ignorance of Mr. Vincent displayed by polite society in Carlingford. No shame to him. It was precisely the same thing in private life which the other would have been in public. Repeal of the Toleration Act, or re-enactment of the Test, are things totally impossible; and when persecution is not to be apprehended or hoped for, where but in the wrongs of a privileged class can the true zest of dissidence be found? Mr. Vincent, who had received his Dissenting principles as matters of doctrine, took up the familiar instruments now with a rush of private feeling. He was not conscious of the power of that sentiment of injury and indignation which possessed him. He believed in his heart that he was but returning, after a temporary hallucination, to the true duties of his post; but the fact was, that this wound in the tenderest point—this general slight and indifference—pricked him forward in all that force of personal complaint which gives warmth and piquancy to a public grievance. The young man said nothing of Lady Western even to his dearest friend—tried not to think of her except by way of imagining how she should one day hear of him, and know his name when it possessed a distinction which neither the perpetual curate of S. Roque's, nor any other figure in that local world, dared hope for. But with fiery zeal he flew to the question of Church and State, and set forth the wrongs which Christianity sustained from endowment, and the heinous evils of rich livings, episcopal palaces, and spiritual lords. It was no mean or ungenerous argument which the young Nonconformist pursued in his fervour of youth and wounded self-regard. It was the natural cry of a man who had entered life at disadvantage, and chafed, without knowing it, at all the phalanx of orders and classes above him, standing close in order to prevent his entrance. With eloquent fervour he expatiated upon the kingdom that was not of this world. If these words were true, what had the Church to do with worldly possessions, rank, dignities, power? Was his Grace of Lambeth more like Paul the tentmaker than his Holiness of Rome? Mr. Vincent went into the whole matter with genuine conviction, and confidence in his own statements. He believed and had been trained in it. In his heart he was persuaded that he himself, oft disgusted and much misunderstood in his elected place at Salem Chapel, ministered the Gospel more closely to his Master's appointment than the rector of

Carlingford, who was nominated by a college, or the curate of S. Roque's, who had his forty pounds a-year from a tiny ancient endowment, and was spending his own little fortune on his church and district. These men had joined God and mammon—they were in the pay of the State. Mr. Vincent thundered forth the lofty censures of an evangelist whom the State did not recognise, and with whom mammon had little enough to do. He brought forth all the weapons out of the Homerton armoury, new, bright, and dazzling; and he did not know any more than his audience that he never would have wielded them so heartily—perhaps would scarcely have taken them off the wall—but for the sudden sting with which his own inferior place, and the existence of a privileged class doubly shut against his entrance, had quickened his personal consciousness. Such, however, was the stimulus which woke the minister of Salem Chapel into action, and produced that series of lectures on Church and State which, as everybody knows, shook society in Carlingford to its very foundation.—*Salem Chapel*, pp. 489, 490.

Her picture of a man, generous, impassioned, eloquent, conscious of intellect and power, and justified in his high estimate of his place in the aristocracy of mind, is not as attractive to the reader as it evidently is to herself, because, perhaps, the character is more tinctured at the core by the influence of his training than she designs to show it. He is a good deal more of a prig than she means him to be, and this, we surmise, from some early prejudices or prepossessions. To the reader it is merely ridiculous in the young minister of Salem Chapel, himself the son of a minister, falling in love at first sight with a fair aristocrat, who drives about in perfumed robes, in a 'heavenly chariot drawn by fiery, prancing horses.' This beauty is very prettily described, and her foolish yet amiable talk is charming; but no sense of personal deserts could make a young man, whose head is not turned by vanity and conceit, fall in love and nourish a flame for a woman so absolutely out of his sphere, and removed from him by circumstances, as the beautiful dowager is from Vincent. It is much more in keeping with some young schoolmaster or Scripture-reader, who has got himself ordained, and fancies himself, on the strength of his new curatorial dignity, a match for the first lady of the land, than with a young man who is in the place for which his birth and education have been gradually preparing him. But this sort of romance belongs to the authoress, who has recourse not only to her early memories, but evidently to those day-dreams which visit imaginative children, before the world as it is dawns upon them.

Lady Western and all the high-bred people in the story are invested with that halo through which a lively poetical fancy, living among homely common surroundings, sees such glimpses of rank and fashion as come in its way. It reminds us of Enid, who saw, in her dreams of the great world, where

'Lords and ladies of the high court went
In silver tissue, talking things of state.'

It is a fair, shadowy, unreal world—unreal not to the eye, for gait, look, and manner, and the general magnificence of finish, the aristocratic ease and haughty grace, are excellently given, but from the ultra finish and success assigned to them. The villain of the story is a 'swell,' a sort of evil divinity, in look and bearing quite above ordinary humanity; and in his wife, disguised though she be as a hard-working, finger-stained seamstress, the light of birth and aristocratic training shine out the more remarkably for the eclipse in which she chooses to shroud herself. Not but that there is a great deal of truth as well as spirit in the delineation of Mrs. Hilyard, though it is allied to more improbability, and almost absurdity, than most writers would venture upon. But one feature of the story is the alliance of an almost fairy-tale improbability, with absolute pre-Raphaelite accuracy of detail, the last of which is the point which makes it suitable for review in our columns, as giving a picture of the domestic and social working of the Voluntary System, unquestionably taken from the life.

It has always been the boast of Independents that their system would redeem the world if it had but room, and our young minister arrives at Carlingford with full faith in it, and in himself:—

'Mr. Vincent arrived at Carlingford in the beginning of winter, when society in that town was reassembling, or at least reappearing, after the temporary summer seclusion. The young man knew very little of the community which he had assumed the spiritual charge of. He was almost as particular as the Rev. Mr. Wentworth, of S. Roque's, about the cut of his coat and the precision of his costume, and decidedly preferred the word "clergyman" to the word "minister," which latter was universally used by his flock; but notwithstanding these trifling predilections, Mr. Vincent, who had been brought up upon the *Nonconformist* and the *Eclectic Review*, was strongly impressed with the idea that the Church Establishment, though outwardly prosperous, was in reality a profoundly rotten institution; that the Nonconforming portion of the English public was the party of progress; that the eyes of the world were turned upon the Dissenting interest; and that his own youthful eloquence and the Voluntary principle were quite enough to counterbalance all the ecclesiastical advantages on the other side, and make for himself a position of the highest influence in his new sphere. As he walked about Carlingford making acquaintance with the place, it occurred to the young man, with a thrill of not ungenerous ambition, that the time might shortly come when Salem Chapel would be all too insignificant for the Nonconformists of this hitherto torpid place. He pictured to himself how, by-and-by, those jealous doors in Grange Lane would fly open at his touch, and how the dormant minds within would awake under his influence. It was a blissful dream to the young pastor. Even the fact that Mr. Tozer was a buttermilk man, and the other managers of the chapel equally humble in their pretensions, did not disconcert him in that flush of early confidence. All he wanted—all any man worthy of his

post wanted—was a spot of standing-ground, and an opportunity of making the Truth—and himself—known. Such, at least, was the teaching of Homerton and the Dissenting organs. Young Vincent, well educated and enlightened according to his fashion, was yet so entirely unacquainted with any world but that contracted one in which he had been brought up, that he believed all this as devoutly as Mr. Wentworth believed in Anglicanism, and would have smiled with calm scorn at any sceptic who ventured to doubt. Thus it will be seen he came to Carlingford with elevated expectations—by no means prepared to circulate among his flock, and say grace at Mrs. Tozer's "teas," and get up *soirées* to amuse the congregation, as Mr. Tufton had been accustomed to do. These secondary circumstances of his charge had little share in the new minister's thoughts. Somehow the tone of public writing has changed of late days. Scarcely a newspaper writer condescends now to address men who are not free of "society," and learned in all its ways. The *Times* and the *Magazines* take it for granted that all their readers dine out at splendid tables, and are used to a solemn attendant behind their chair. Young Vincent was one of those who accept the flattering implication. It is true, he saw few enough of such celestial scenes in his college days. But now that life was opening upon him, he doubted nothing of the society that must follow; and with a swell of gratification listened when the advantages of Carlingford were discussed by some chance fellow-travellers on the railway; its pleasant parties—its nice people—Mr. Wodehouse's capital dinners, and the charming breakfasts—such a delightful novelty!—so easy and agreeable!—of the pretty Lady Western, the young dowager. In imagination Mr. Vincent saw himself admitted to all these social pleasures; not that he cared for capital dinners more than became a young man, or had any special tendencies towards tuft-hunting, but because fancy and hope, and ignorance of the real world, made him naturally project himself into the highest sphere within his reach, in the simple conviction that such was his natural place.—*Ibid.* pp. 209, 210.

The first touch of reality must be 'a cold plunge' to this state of expectancy. It comes to Vincent in the shape of a six-o'clock tea-party at Mrs. Tozer's, wife of Tozer, buttermilk and deacon, a prosperous tradesman and the most influential member of the connexion. No stiffness of orthodoxy can prevent our feelings being at once enlisted for the young minister, not for the inflictions of Tozer himself, who, we own, generally carries us along with him; but for the course of embarrassments the scene as a whole, and the ladies in particular, bring upon him. Tozer was habited in the overwhelming black suit and white tie which produced so solemnizing an effect every Sunday; but the ladies were brilliant: and we gather from these pages, that splendour of attire is at present one point of self and sect assertion on which female Nonconformity lays great stress. We are the more disposed to believe this; because we know that the mildest sumptuary laws, as applied to the children, have no place in their schools, and that children stunted in feathers and flowers at the Church Sunday schools of our towns take themselves off at once at their own will, or their indignant parents', to the Dissenters, whose processions of

scholars are all on end with these decorations. Foremost, in youthful charms, wreaths, and pink robes, is Miss Phoebe Tozer, whose interest and preference gives the minister so many perplexing moments; but his immediate troubles arise from the matrons of the assembly, who are anxious to put his position and his duties before him in their true light without delay. His interesting appearance and his first sermons constitute him a star; indeed his sufferings never arise from neglect: this aspect of the system shows itself later in a minister's career. Mrs. Tozer makes room for him by her side, assuring him that none present grudge him the best place, which somehow turns the conversation upon pastors, who marry, injudiciously and to please themselves, wives disposed to look down upon the congregation. This is a point upon which Mrs. Pigeon, also a deacon's wife, is strong:—

"'Nobody cares less than me about them vain shows. What's visiting, if you know the vally of your time? Nothing but a laying-up of judgment. But I wouldn't be put upon neither by a chit that got her bread out of me and my husband's hard earnings; and so I told my sister, Mrs. Tozer, as lives at Parson's Green."

"'Poor thing!' said the gentler Mrs. Tozer, 'it's hard lines on a minister's wife to please the congregation. Mr. Vincent here, he'll have to take a lesson. That Mrs. Bailey was pretty-looking, I must allow—'"

"'Sweetly pretty!' whispered Phoebe, clasping her plump pink hands.

"'Pretty-looking! I don't say anything against it,' continued her mother; 'but it's hard upon a minister when his wife won't take no pains to please his flock. To have people turn up their noses at you ain't pleasant—'"

"'And them getting their livin' off you all the time,' cried Mrs. Pigeon, clinching the milder speech.

"'But it seems to me,' said poor Vincent, 'that a minister can no more be said to get his living off you than any other man. He works hard enough generally for what little he has. And really, Mrs. Tozer, I'd rather not hear all these unfortunate particulars about one of my brethren—'"

"'He ain't one of the brethren now,' broke in the poulterer's wife. 'He's been gone out o' Parson's Green this twelvemonths. Them stuck-up ways may do with the Church folks as can't help themselves, but they will never do with us Dissenters. Not that we ain't as glad as can be to see you, Mr. Vincent, and I hope you'll favour my poor house another night like you're favouring Mrs. Tozer's. Mr. Tufton always said that was the beauty of Carlingford in our connexion. Cheerful folks and no display. No display, you know—nothing but a hearty meetin', sorry to part, and happy to meet again. Them's our ways. And the better you know us, the better you'll like us, I'll be bound to say. We don't put it all on the surface, Mr. Vincent,' continued Mrs. Pigeon, shaking out her skirts and expanding herself on her chair, 'but it's all real and solid; what we say we mean—and we don't say more than we mean—and them's the kind of folks to trust to wherever you go.'—*Ibid.* pp. 211, 212.

Then follows Mrs. Brown, an influential member of the flock, who is naturally anxious to assert her view of things:—

"'We never have had nobody in our connexion worth speaking of in

Carlingford but's been in trade. And a very good thing too, as I tell Brown. For if there's one thing I can't abear in a chapel, it's one set setting up above the rest. But bein' all in the way of business, except just the poor folks, as is all very well in their place, and never interferes with nothing, and don't count, there's nothing but brotherly love here, which is a deal more than most ministers can say for their flocks. I've asked a few friends to tea, Mr. Vincent, on next Thursday, at six. As I haven't got no daughters just out of a boarding-school to write notes for me, will you take us in a friendly way, and just come without another invitation? All our own folks, sir, and a comfortable evening; and prayers, if you'll be so good, at the end. I don't like the new fashions," said Mrs. Brown, with a significant glance towards Mrs. Tozer, "of separatin' like heathens, when all's of one connexion. We might never meet again, Mr. Vincent. In the midst of life, you know, sir. You'll not forget Thursday, at six."

"But, my dear Mrs. Brown, I am very sorry: Thursday is one of the days I have specially devoted to study," stammered forth the unhappy pastor. "What with the Wednesday meeting and the Friday committee—"

"Mrs. Brown drew herself up as well as the peculiarities of her form permitted, and her roseate countenance assumed a deeper glow. "We've been in the chapel longer than Tozer," said the offended deaconness. "We've never been backward in takin' trouble, nor spendin' our substance, nor putting our hands to every good work; and as for making a difference between one member and another, it's what we ain't been accustomed to, Mr. Vincent. I'm a plain woman, and speak my mind. Old Mr. Tufton was very particular to show no preference. He always said, it never answered in a flock to show more friendship to one nor another; and if it had been put to me, I wouldn't have said, I assure you, sir, that it was us as was to be made the first example of. If I haven't a daughter fresh out of a boarding-school, I've been a member at Salem five-and-twenty year, and had ministers in my house many's the day, and as friendly as if I were a duchess; and for charities and such things, we've never been known to fail, though I say it; and as for trouble—"

"But I spoke of my study," said the poor minister, as she paused, her indignation growing too eloquent for words: "you want me to preach on Sunday, don't you? and I must have some time, you know, to do my work."

"Sir," said Mrs. Brown, severely, "I know it for a fact that Mr. Wentworth of S. Roque's dines out five days in the week, and it don't do his sermons no injury; and when you go out to dinner, it stands to reason it's a different thing from a friendly tea."—*Ibid.* pp. 213, 214.

We can hardly wonder that it was with a sensation of 'dreadful dwindlement' Vincent crossed the street again to his lodgings, and somehow found he had come down in the world all at once; or that in receiving a letter from a Homerton friend, full of their joint hopes for the cause, and belief in themselves as priests of the poor, he could not feel himself a martyr in the sense intended. The poor, he knew, were mostly Church-goers, if they went anywhere. Amid the 'rude luxuries and common-place plenty he had shared the evening before,' life could have no heroic circumstances. This subdued and depressed state of mind suffers further aggravation from the arrival, by the hands of the fair Phœbe, of a 'shape of jelly' left untouched

from the evening's celebration. The irritation strikes us as misplaced. Offerings in kind are not always unwelcome, nor any sign of want of taste in the donor. But circumstances make all the difference in such matters. We consider that this history may be regarded as a sort of homage to the position of curate, not now in the highest favour with those who share the title. They stand on an elevation which secures them from any sense of humiliation on similar occasions. It is taken for granted that they have a certain dignity of their own to support them under all questionable postures: while this affair of the shape of jelly not unnaturally forces upon Vincent the idea that he had no special right to his pretensions, and that if his mind were on a level with his fortunes he ought to be satisfied with the society and the entertainments of the Pigeons and Tozers.

We are next introduced to Mr. Tufton, the quondam pastor who had been saved a pressing hint to retire by the timely intervention of a mild fit of paralysis, but who had got on very fairly with the flock from being of a temper better suited for the trial, and, as his wife expresses it, 'not one to take a deal of notice of any unpleasantness.' The heavy complacency, conventional piety, and stereotyped phraseology of this old gentleman, whose white hair had so long been apostrophized as venerable at all the Salem tea-parties, who waves a large, soft, flabby, ministerial hand, talks of 'dear Tozer,' and promises Vincent the benefit of his advice and experience, are given from the life. It is an old charge brought by the more cynical laity of this denomination, that the children of their ministers are less influenced by religion than those of the flock. We find it in a book on Sunday-schools put forth by authority—'It is, we fear, a fact that the 'children of the ministry rarely seek and find the God of their 'fathers in early youth;' and the minister's daughter here bears out the suspicion. Adelaide Tufton, the hopeless invalid, confined to her father's company and the one parlour surrounded by engravings of ministers of the connexion, and not altogether uncheerful, through the influence of good Mrs. Tufton, is certainly a case in point. The way in which she breaks in upon her father's platitudes, and her caustic comments upon them, are not a little startling. The picture of a keen observation and quick intelligence restricted to a range of the narrowest interests and the indulgence of an insatiable curiosity about people she can never even see, is painful, but not uncommon. Through her mastery of the art of gossip she has contrived to neutralize her own disabilities and to escape the obtrusive pity of Salem; by it she indemnifies herself for the dreary seclusion of her life. It is very true that no one knows so much of what goes on as an invalid that cares to know, and has strength of mind to still her

own complaints. Adelaide had begun making easy inquiries of Vincent as to the ladies' dresses on the previous evening, till—

'Mr. Tufton broke in, in solemn bass:

"Adelaide, we shouldn't talk, my dear, of pink and green silks. Providence has laid you aside, my love, from temptations; and you remember how often I used to say in early days, No doubt it was a blessing, Jemima, coming when it did, to wean our girl from the world; she might have been as fond of dress as other girls, and brought us to ruin, but for her misfortune. Everything is for the best."

"Oh, bother!" said Adelaide, sharply—"I don't complain, and never did; but everybody else finds my misfortune, as they call it, very easy to be borne, Mr. Vincent—even papa, you see. There is a reason for everything, to be sure, but how things that are hard and disagreeable are always to be called for the best, I can't conceive. However, let us return to Phoebe Tozer's pink dress. Weren't you rather stunned with all their grandeur?"

* * * * *

"I am afraid, Adelaide, my dear," said Mr. Tufton, in his bass tones, "that my young brother will not think this very improving conversation. Dear Tozer was speaking to me yesterday about the sermon to the children. I always preached them a sermon to themselves about this time of the year. My plan has been to take the congregation in classes; the young men—ah, and they're specially important are the young men! Dear Tozer suggested that some popular lectures now would not come amiss. After a long pastorate like mine," said the good man, blandly, unconscious that dear Tozer had already begun to suggest a severance of that tie before gentle sickness did it for him, "a congregation may be supposed to be a little unsettled—without any offence to you, my dear brother. If I could appear myself and show my respect to your ministry, it would have a good effect, no doubt; but I am laid aside, laid aside, brother Vincent! I can only help you with my prayers."

"But dear, dear, Mr. Tufton!" cried his wife, "bless you, the chapel is twice as full as it was six months ago—and natural too, with a nice young man."

"My dear!" said the old minister, in reproof. "Yes, quite natural—curiosity about a stranger; but my young brother must not be elated; nor discouraged when they drop off. A young pastor's start in life is attended by many trials. There is always a little excitement at first, and an appearance of seats letting and the ladies very polite to you. Take it easy, my dear brother! Don't expect too much. In a year or two—by-and-by, when things settle down—then you can see how it's going to be."

"But don't you think it possible that things may never settle down, but continue rising up instead?" said Mr. Vincent, making a little venture in the inspiration of the moment.

Mr. Tufton shook his head and raised his large hands slowly, with a deprecating regretful motion, to hold them over the fire. "Alas! he's got the fever already," said the old minister. "My dear young brother, you shall have my experience to refer to always. You're always welcome to my advice. Dear Tozer said to me just yesterday, 'You point out the pitfalls to him, Mr. Tufton, and give him your advice, and I'll take care that he shan't go wrong outside,' says dear Tozer. Ah, an invaluable man!"

"But a little disposed to interfere, I think," said Vincent, with an

irrestrainable inclination to show his profound disrelish of all the advice which was about to be given him.

Mr. Tufton raised his heavy forefinger and shook it slowly. "No—no. Be careful, my dear brother. You must keep well with your deacons. You must not take up prejudices against them. Dear Tozer is a man of a thousand—a man of a thousand! Dear Tozer, if you listen to him, will keep you out of trouble. The trouble he takes and the money he spends for Salem Chapel is, mark my words, unknown—and," added the old pastor, awfully syllabing the long word in his solemn bass, "inconceivable."

"He is a bore and an ass for all that," said the daring invalid opposite, with perfect equanimity, as if uttering the most patent and apparent of truths. "Don't you give in to him, Mr. Vincent."—*Ibid.* pp. 221—223.

The real hero of the story will to many readers be, not the morbid, sensitive, self-conscious, and, in fact, selfish minister, but Tozer, the deacon. Vincent never forgets himself, and has always something more absorbing and interesting to think of than what he is about at the moment, or the most vital and critical concerns of those nearest to him. He is perpetually surprising and disconcerting people by his want of sympathy. This is the tendency of all characters who are shown to us from the interpenetrating point of view—all the conflict of motives and impulses laid bare; but it is not an attractive feature. If we are interested in what is going on, and we are very much interested in the goings on at Salem, we like the persons concerned to be so too. Salem Chapel is repulsive to Vincent; but there is too much stir and life in it under this writer's lively appreciation, the vulgarity is touched with too genial a humour, to be so to us. In fact, no novel can give an adequate idea of a dull unattractive life: either it is glossed over by merely taking for granted the dullness, or, if the details are given, mere truth of description deceives the reader into an interest in the scene itself. Moreover, in Vincent's case he is always in the ungracious position of repelling advances. A man who is thought a star, whose efforts are rewarded by an overflowing congregation, need not be an object of pity to most of us, taking a purely mundane and natural view of the situation: though here the curate cannot properly enter into the Dissenting minister's position, it being one thing to be confined by situation and temporary circumstances to unrefined society and another to find it your only sphere wherever you go. Again, Vincent is uninteresting from his total want of religious fervour: as we see him we feel that Pigeon must be right in his constant criticism, that his sermons are clever, but that they 'fail in the application,' as so many clever young men's do. There is not much unction in Tozer, it is not the writer's line to depict it; or we ought perhaps to say, her subject has not left a fit opening for it; but

he is zealous, heart and soul, in his cause, and no private end ever allows him for an instant to forget it. He is a creation of Dissent, our Church does not make nor could it find employment for such men; but he does not act with a dissenting *animus*. He is not by nature a schismatic, his impulse is constructive and conservative; he opposes the Church with a sort of rude High Churchmanship of his own, a loyalty to Salem and 'our connexion' as the only Church he realizes. His worst spite has no hatred in it. Under other circumstances he might have made an invaluable churchwarden, practical, perhaps not over meddlesome; but it must be granted certain administrative talents would have wanted a field. He would have been a humbler and a much less vulgar man, but not so able a one. But it is time he should speak for himself. Vincent has the privilege of escorting Miss Phœbe home from a singing-class, and is warmly welcomed by the mother:—

"Do you now take off your greatcoat and make yourself comfortable," said Mrs. Tozer; "there's a bit of supper coming presently. This is just what I like, is this. A party is very well in its way, Mr. Vincent, sir; but when a gentleman comes in familiar, and takes us just as we are, that's what I like. We never can be took wrong of an evening, Tozer and me; there's always a bit of something comfortable for supper; and after the shop's shut in them long evenings, time's free. Phœbe, make haste and take off your things. What a colour you've got, to be sure, with the night air! I declare, pa, somebody must have been saying something to her, or she'd never look so bright."

"I daresay there's more things than music gets talked of at the singing," said Tozer, thus appealed to. "But she'd do a deal better if she'd try to improve her mind than take notice what the young fellows says."

"Oh, pa, the idea! and before Mr. Vincent too," cried Phœbe."—
Ibid. p. 262.

Here, again, our experience tallies with this hint. The young people of Dissenting congregations are brought together by their system in a way that not a little offends our stricter notions of discipline. No one can pass an Independent meeting, on a fine Sunday evening, while its congregation is dispersing, without noting, and, indeed, being impeded by, the groups of young men and women lingering round the doors, in easy, often jocular, conversation, much too absorbed with one another to heed the passer-by, who, picking his way along the carriage-road, is driven to reflect on the causes of popular dissent, and to think he sees the reason why so-and-so and such an one had left the Church, which they had never adorned by their piety, because 'they found they got more good at chapel.'

The ladies having left the room for a time, the minister and deacon are left together:—

"Three more pews applied for this week—fifteen sittings in all," said Mr. Tozer; "that's what I call satisfactory, that is. We mustn't let the steam go down—not on no account. You keep well at them on Sundays, Mr. Vincent, and trust to the managers, sir, to keep 'em up to their dooty. Me and Mr. Tufton was consulting the other day. He says as we oughtn't to spare you, and you oughtn't to spare yourself. There hasn't been such a opening not in our connexion for fifteen year. We all look to you to go into it, Mr. Vincent. If all goes as I expect, and you keep up as you're doing, I see no reason why we shouldn't be able to put another fifty to the salary next year."

"Oh!" said poor Vincent, with a miserable face. He had been rather pleased to hear about the "opening," but this matter-of-fact encouragement and stimulus threw him back into dismay and disgust.

"Yes," said the deacon, "though I wouldn't advise you, as a young man settin' out in life, to calculate upon it, yet we all think it's more than likely; but if you was to ask my advice, I'd say to give it 'em a little more plain—meaning the Church folks. It's expected of a new man. I'd touch 'em up in the State Church line, Mr. Vincent, if I was you. Give us a course upon the anomalies, and that sort of thing—the bishops in their palaces, and the fishermen as was the start of it all; there's a deal to be done in that way. It always tells; and my opinion is as you might secure the most part of the young men and thinkers, and them as can see what's what, if you lay it on pretty strong. Not," added the deacon, remembering in time to add that necessary salve to the conscience—"not as I would have you neglect what's more important; but, after all, what *is* more important, Mr. Vincent, than freedom of opinion and choosing your own religious teacher? You can't put Gospel truth in a man's mind till you've freed him out of them bonds. It stands to reason—as long as he believes just what he's told, and has it all made out for him, the very words he's to pray, there may be feelin', sir, but there can't be no spiritual understandin' in that man."

"Well, one can't deny that there have been enlightened men in the Church of England," said the young Nonconformist, with lofty candour. "The inconsistencies of the human mind are wonderful; and it is coming to be pretty clearly understood in the intellectual world, that a man may show the most penetrating genius, and even the widest liberality, and yet be led a willing slave in the bonds of religious rite and ceremony. One cannot understand it, it is true; but in our clearer atmosphere we are bound to exercise Christian charity. Great as the advantages are on our side of the question, I would not willingly hurt the feelings of a sincere Churchman, who, for anything I know, may be the best of men."

Mr. Tozer paused with a "humph!" of uncertainty; rather dazzled with the fine language, but doubtful of the sentiment. At length light seemed to dawn upon the excellent buttermilk. "Bless my soul! that's a new view," said Tozer; "that's taking the superior line over them! My impression is as that would tell beautiful. Eh! it's famous, that is! I've heard a many gentlemen attacking the Church, like, from down below, and giving it her about her money and her greatness, and all that; but our clearer atmosphere—there's the point! I always knew as you was a clever young man, Mr. Vincent, and expected a deal from you; but that's a new view, that is!"—*Ibid.* pp. 262—263.

As supper proceeds, that supper which was the pride of Mrs. Tozer's heart, her husband offers a suggestion which strikes us as marking an essential difference between ourselves and the particular denomination over which Mr. Tozer presided:—

"I am very partial to your style, Mr. Vincent," said the deacon; "there's just one thing I'd like to observe, sir, if you'll excuse *me*. I'd give 'em a coorse; there's nothing takes like a coorse in our connexion. Whether it's on a chapter or a book of Scripture, or on a perticklar doctrine, I'd make a pint of giving 'em a coorse if it was me. There was Mr. Bailey, of Parson's Green, as was so popular before he married—he had a historical coorse in the evenings, and a coorse upon the eighth of Romans in the morning; and it was astonishing to see how they took. I walked over many and many's the summer evening myself, he kep' up the interest so. There ain't a cleverer man in our body, nor wasn't a better liked as he was then."

"And now I understand he's gone away—what was the reason?" asked Mr. Vincent.

Tozer shrugged his shoulders and shook his head. "All along of the women; they didn't like his wife; and my own opinion is, he fell off dreadful."—*Ibid.* p. 264.

Here we cannot sympathize, nor does our observation at all go along with the deacon's. If a man is moderately dull at ordinary times, he is sometimes extraordinarily dull in a course; for a course has some affinity in idea with a series of sermons from a single text—the congregation has not room for the same amount of expectation and change; but probably where there are no Seasons to be observed, no suggestions coming naturally in the order of a liturgy, the minister may feel with the poet—

'Me this unchartered freedom tires,'

and he and congregation alike be glad to be bound to something.

Perhaps the authoress in no way shows her regard for her deacon more directly than by putting him in the questionable position of appreciating the beauty of the young dowager, who fascinates the young minister, and who quite innocently, from a mere foolish love of pleasing and consciousness of charms—by her implied testimony to his good air, and a certain gracious tone of equality in their chance meetings at the mysterious Mrs. Hilyard's—betrays him, or suffers him to betray himself, into a fool's paradise, which, of course, makes the society of his congregation in their back parlours, redolent of the cheese and bacon in the shop, almost tragically intolerable. He had been making timid inquiries after the fair vision, whom he had seen for the first time, when Tozer, to the astonishment of his wife, who was cutting bread with a large knife at the time, exclaims—

"She's a beautiful young creature. I mayn't approve of such goings-on, but I can't shut my eyes. She deals with me regular, and I can tell you the shop looks like a different place when them eyes of hers are in it. She's out of our line, and she's out of your line, Mr. Vincent," added Tozer, apologetically, coming down from his sudden enthusiasm, "or I mightn't

say as much as I do say, for she's gay, and always a-giving parties, and spending her life in company, as I don't approve of; but to look in her face, you couldn't say a word against her—nor I couldn't. She might lead a man out of his wits, and I wouldn't not to say blame him. If the angels are nicer to look at, it's a wonder to me!"—*Ibid.* p. 265.

Beauty is evidently a weakness with our authoress; she loves to parade its triumphs. If the young dowager thus strikes 'the connexion,' no wonder that the branch of Masters' shop established in Carlingford is devoted to her; the whole establishment, as she enters 'with a sweet flutter and rustle of sound,' flying at her behests.

The touches in describing the High Church bookseller show a sort of outside observation, which may mark how external the authoress has been in her time to Church ways and features, and to the Church's social prestige; probably not without a yearning after them.

"And two copies of the *Christian Year*," said Lady Western, suddenly. "Oh, thank you so much! but I know they are all on the side-table, and I shall go and look at them. Not the very smallest copy, Mr. Masters, and not that solemn one with the red edges; something pretty, with a little ornament and gilding: they are for two little *protégées* of mine! Oh, here is exactly what I want! another one like this, please. How very obliging all your people are," said her ladyship, benignly.—*Ibid.* p. 275.

It is quite a pretty scene; and the minister is there to see it, having strayed into Masters' shop—where, we are given to understand, his presence was far from welcome—perhaps because it was the last place in the world which his masters at the chapel would have advised him to enter.

But whatever sympathy Vincent may meet with from mankind for this aberration, he finds none in the ladies of his congregation. The fact of his having dined with Lady Western, coupled with his neglect of the Pigeon family, and failure in those attentions the leading members of the congregation were accustomed to demand from their minister, leads to the breach which finally brings on the catastrophe. As Mrs. Pigeon ably sums up the requirements of the connexion, 'What we want is 'a man as preaches gospel sermons—real rousing-up discourses—and sits down pleasant to his tea, and makes hisself friendly.' We cannot believe that this sociable definition of duty is difficult of fulfilment. There is in all communities a brisk mediocrity which adapts itself to these circumstances and to the bondage implied with more than resignation. What the authoress has set herself to show is, that they do not suit men of independent mind and original ideas. The course of the story involves Vincent in a series of distracting family trials. His mother and sister, living at a distance from him, form

the acquaintance of the aristocratic villain before alluded to. He engages to marry Susan, while in reality he is the husband of Mrs. Hilyard, the mysterious seamstress. This lady, by birth a Russell, lives in concealment to keep out of his way, and has chosen to connect herself with Salem, and to patronize Vincent's sermons; for the indulgence of her sardonic interest and amusement in the varieties and workings of human character, rather than with any thought of spiritual benefit. Mrs. Vincent comes upon the scene, to consult her son on some anonymous intimations she has received; and in her absence the infamous lover entraps Susan, under pretence of following her mother, to leave her home with him. Vincent's frenzied fears and rage, and the journeys he takes in pursuit—journeys, by the way, which would run away twice over with any curate's salary—occupy a good deal of space in the story, and constitute its romantic side, with which we will not interfere. Mrs. Vincent's, the widowed mother's, part is to connect these two discordant elements. She is intensely a mother, and as intensely a minister's wife. In one capacity she belongs to Salem, in the other to romance. She is very well drawn, with innumerable careful touches, as though from the life. But she is something of a bore, and illustrates the writer's propensity to keep her reader on tenterhooks. The action of the story is hampered by a character that never keeps time. We are partly interested by the melodrama, partly anxious to get back to Salem and Tozer; and the elaborately drawn, tedious, and yet cleverly depicted little widow, who is further a difficulty to us from the unnatural attribute of age assigned to this mother of a lovely girl of eighteen, constantly stops the way.

The writer evidently feels herself on the sure ground of observation, but it is rather too pitiable a picture. This sensitive mind—'quite the lady,' according to the judgment of Salem, possessed by the notion of keeping up appearances, and with all impulse and unrestrained action quenched out of her by a fear of the flock that has eaten into the very soul—this predominant submission to the necessity of making a fair show—is not really fit for minute delineation, unless relieved by comedy. Mrs. Vincent is too tragic: her supreme efforts at composure, her perpetual struggle to conceal suspense and anguish amongst the Pigeons and the Tozers, her dread of what the congregation may think, her anxiety to put a good face upon her son's actions, the perpetual innocent duplicity, are too painful to be amusing. 'The flock,' *en masse*, is seen by her in wolves' clothing; her careful civility, under suppressed offence and displeasure, we feel to be a sort of injustice. No character is really interesting

that sees things through but one medium. Maternal instinct, if the only instinct, is only an enlarged selfishness. But this is the way this very able but still feminine writer sees things, and through which she is unjust wherever there is injustice. Her tendency is to search in everybody for the one ruling passion. She has so much more faith in personal motives than public and general ones, in feeling than the persuasions of reason, that not a single person in the book acts on his avowed principles. We have seen how the minister is actuated solely by personal feeling in those public demonstrations which gain him prestige with his people. Tozer, the only character with a spark of real public spirit, never gets a step beyond the four walls of Salem, and tests every question, however remote, by the degree in which it may advance the Dissenting interest, and so let the pews. Every word of Phoebe is with the single aim of securing the minister to herself; all that Mrs. Tozer says concerns her social and maternal consequence; and when the congregation combine in seeing that the minister's head is turned, one and all are moved by a sense of personal neglect. Mrs. Vincent sees only with mother's eyes—the abstract mother in what concerns her daughter, and the minister's mother towards her son. In this relation every action, every word of the 'gentle diplomatist and Jesuit' has some ulterior view; nothing is said without a purpose, or *with* the professed one. This universal private single aim of course detracts from the nature and probability of the picture. Our principles on the one hand, and the natural influences of the moment on the other, have more to do with the human economy than writers of this class make them to have; so that while we feel the truth of each touch, we know that in real life influences not allowed for have a retarding weight, and prevent things turning out as they would under the working of mere private ends.

The hero's harrowing domestic troubles introduce us to a third portrait of a Dissenting minister. Vincent is the unmanageable genius, Tufton the heavy mediocrity of the old school. Mr. Beecher, the supply from Homerton, brisk, quick-witted, not too refined, satisfied with himself and with his sphere, and able to see things from the point of view of his party, is the natural result of modern training. To him Tozer and Pigeon are 'the strength of our connexion—not great people you know, but the flower of the middle classes'; he can appreciate the comfortable teas, and estimate the advantages of the position as a possible future contingency, while reporting the general rejoicing of Homerton that Vincent in going to Carlingford 'had made an 'it.' He can preach a sermon, too, on the approved model, with a deal that was practical in it, accord-

ing to Tozer, and superior to Vincent's in the one point of application, and of pressing home upon the conscience; suggesting to all hearers (for the idea of change is ever present to congregations who have the choice in their hands) that 'if ever we should be in the way of hearing candidates again, "they" would put down that young man's name for an 'earing.'

We have a glimpse, too, of a fourth minister, the eminent and genial Mr. Raffles, who comes to preside at the tea-meeting, which, in virtue of his independent mind and superior refinement, Vincent cannot be persuaded to lead, though he consents to be present and to speak. The whole description of the tea-meeting is capital. We feel that as an institution these tea-meetings belong to Dissent, and can scarcely flourish elsewhere, though there are most painstaking and energetic efforts in our towns to adapt them to modern Church needs. The insurmountable difficulty, however, with us, except where a clergyman's influence is such as to overcome all ordinary hindrances, is, that all the managers feel the thing a bore, and enter into it and carry it through from mere grim sense of duty, with heart-sinking at its commencement and relief when it is over, apt to be not undisturbed by taste offended by a vague sense of failure or annoyance. Now, rejoicings of all sorts cannot prosper unless the main promoters rejoice too. Pleasure to do any good and answer its end ought not to be a pretence; and we understand from this writer's lively history of the tea-meeting in the schoolroom under the chapel, with its cheerful details, its appreciation of the "unlimited crockery, and boilers, within themselves, which were the pride of Salem;" its brilliant gas-lights, crowded tables, and hissing urns—that the scene so freshly and ably depicted is drawn from some fount of pleasant association, and that some similar gathering has for some reason or other at one time engaged her sympathies, or at least given her genial amusement. She even draws a bright picture of the young ladies decorating the bare walls with texts and evergreens, fearlessly investing them with something of the charm which hangs round Italian peasants making festive preparations, or Anglican young ladies wreathing Gothic columns. Rectors, and even curates, have an awkward notion of condescension, even when they throw themselves heartily into such scenes. They may do good, and promote unity of feeling, but they have to put themselves into a frame. Now, Mr. Raffles is in his place at a tea-meeting, and thoroughly at home, with no thought of being a victim—indeed, conscious of the occasion as of one where it was worth while to shine. And a very good figure he makes: we prefer it to that of his young brother:—

‘Mr. Raffles was very popular in Carlingford, as everywhere. To secure him for a tea-meeting was to secure its success. He examined into all the preparations, tasted the cake, pricked his fingers with the garlands, to the immense delight of the young ladies, and complimented them on their skill with beaming cheerfulness; while the minister of Salem, on the contrary, stalked about by his side pale and preoccupied, with difficulty keeping himself from that contempt of the actual things around to which youth is so often tempted. His mind wandered off to the companion of his last night’s walk—to the stranger pacing up and down that damp garden with inscrutable unknown thoughts—to the beautiful creature within those lighted windows, so near and yet so overwhelmingly distant—as if somehow they had abstracted his life and got it among themselves. Mr. Vincent had little patience for what he considered the mean details of existence nearer at hand. As soon as he could possibly manage it, he escaped, regarding with a certain hopeless disgust the appearance he had to make in the evening, and without finding a single civil thing to say to the fair decorators. “My young brother looks sadly low and out of spirits,” said jolly Mr. Raffles. “What do you mean by being so unkind to the minister, Miss Phœbe, eh?” Poor Phœbe blushed pinker than ever while the rest laughed. It was pleasant to be supposed “unkind” to the minister; and Phœbe resolved to do what she could to cheer him when she sat by his elbow at the platform table making tea for the visitors of the evening.

‘The evening came, and there was not a ticket to be had anywhere in Carlingford: the schoolroom, with its blazing gas, its festoons, and its mottoes, its tables groaning with dark-complexioned plumcake and heavy buns, was crowded quite beyond its accommodation, and the edifying sight might be seen of Tozer and his brother deacons, and indeed all who were sufficiently interested in the success of Salem to sacrifice themselves on its behalf, making an erratic but not unsubstantial tea in corners, to make room for the crowd. And in the highest good humour was the crowd which surrounded all the narrow tables. The urns were well filled, the cake abundant, the company in its best attire. The ladies had bonnets, it is true, but these bonnets were worthy the occasion. At the table on the platform sat Mr. Raffles, in the chair, beaming upon the assembled party, with cheerful little Mrs. Tufton and Mrs. Brown at one side of him, and Phœbe looking very pink and pretty, shaded from the too enthusiastic admiration of the crowd below by the tea-urn at which she officiated. Next to her, the minister cast abstracted looks upon the assembly. He was, oh so interesting in his silence and pallor!—he spoke little; and when any one addressed him, he had to come back as if from a distance to hear. If anybody could imagine that Mr. Raffles contrasted dangerously with Mr. Vincent in that reserve and quietness, it would be a mistake unworthy a philosophic observer. On the contrary, the Salem people were all doubly proud of their pastor. It was not to be expected that such a man as he should unbend as the reverend chairman did. They preferred that he should continue on his stilts. It would have been a personal humiliation to the real partisans of the chapel, had he really woke up and come down from that elevation. The more commonplace the ordinary “connexion” was, the more proud they felt of their student and scholar. So Mr. Vincent leaned his head upon his hands and gazed unmolested over the lively company, taking in all the particulars of the scene, the busy groups engaged in mere tea-making and tea-consuming—the flutter of enjoyment among humble girls and womankind who knew no pleasure more exciting—the whispers which pointed out himself to strangers among the party—the triumphant face of Tozer at the end of the room, jammed

against the wall, drinking tea out of an empty sugar-basin.'—*Ibid.* pp. 501, 502.

When the speech-making began, that supreme, most embarrassing point of the whole trying programme of uncongenial spirits, the chairman was cheerfully equal to the occasion:—

'Mr. Raffles made quite one of his best speeches; he kept his audience in a perpetual flutter of laughter and applause; he set forth all the excellencies of the new minister with such detail and fulness as only the vainest would have swallowed. But the pleased congregation still applauded. He praised Mr. Tufton, the venerable father of the community; he praised the admirable deacons; he praised the arrangements. In short, Mr. Raffles applauded everybody, and everybody applauded Mr. Raffles.'—*Ibid.* p. 503.

We do not quite understand, in her portrait of the younger minister, whether the authoress means us to think him offensively conceited. His conduct on this occasion is in distinct accordance with his character, and is probably to the full as correct a likeness as Mr. Raffles, but we are not clear what her intention is in drawing it. To us the influences which prompted Vincent to his lofty ignoring of the obvious inspiration of the scene are from the same sectarian source as those which developed the unctuous geniality of the chairman. The simple pride the audience take in what they do not understand is, in fact, a much more dangerous snare and vanity than mere commonplace popularity. Vincent, 'gathering himself up dreamily from Phœbe Tozer's side,' indulges in a strain of gloomy speculation on humanity and things in general as remote as possible from the scene and the occasion, and, in fact, amuses himself with frightening his audience, a freak in which his historian so far sympathizes, as to say—

'Somehow, even when one disapproves of one's self for doing it, one has a certain enjoyment in bewildering the world. Mr. Vincent was rather pleased with his success, although it was only a variety of "humbug." He entertained with Christian satisfaction the thought that he had succeeded in introducing a certain visionary uneasiness into the lively atmosphere of the tea-meeting—and he was delighted with his own cleverness in spite of himself.'—*Ibid.* p. 504.

We think there is that difference between Church and Dissenting audiences that this sort of superciliousness could not be fostered to such a growth amongst us. We have checks to self-display which they have not. But this is the culminating point of Vincent's prosperity. His private troubles presently become importunate. His sister comes upon the scene under circumstances startling enough to daunt any congregation, she being even suspected of murder, and certainly to justify Vincent in the attempt to devolve his duties for one Sunday upon another. But here Tozer interposes—Tozer, who has stood his friend, fought his battles, managed all but the women,

pitied his distresses, but expects some sacrifices in return, and knows the mind of Salem.

"Tozer did all but neglect his business to meet the emergency; he carried matters with rather a high hand in the meetings of the managing committee; he took absolute control, or wished to do so, of Vincent's proceedings. "We'll tide it over, we'll tide it over," he said, rubbing his hands. To go in, in this state of mind, secure in his own resources and in the skill with which he could guide the wavering mind of Salem, fluctuating as it did between horror and sympathy, doubtful whether to take up the minister's cause with zeal, or to cast him off and disown him, and to find the minister himself giving in, deserting his post at the most critical moment, and making useless all that his patron was doing for him, was too much for the deacon's patience. He sat down in indignant surprise opposite Vincent, and struck his stick against the floor involuntarily, by way of emphasis to his words.

"Mr. Vincent, sir, this ain't the thing to do. I tell you it ain't the thing to do. Salem has a right to expect different," cried Tozer, in the warmth of his disappointment; "a congregation as has never said a word, and office-bearers as have stuck to you and stood up for you whatever folks liked to say! I'm a man as will never desert my pastor in trouble; but I'd like to know what you call this, Mr. Vincent, but a deserting of me. What's the good of fighting for the minister, if he gives in and sends for another man, and won't face nothing for himself? It's next Sunday as is all the battle. Get that over, and things will come straight. When they see you in the pulpit in your old way, and all things as they was, bless you, they'll get used to it, and won't mind the papers no more nor—nor I do. I tell you, sir, it's next Sunday as is the battle. I don't undertake to answer for the consequences, not if you gives in, and has Mr. Beecher down for next Sunday. It ain't the thing to do, Mr. Vincent; Salem folks won't put up with that. Your good mother, poor thing, wouldn't say no different. If you mean to stay and keep things straight in Carlingford, you'll go into that pulpit, and look as if nothing had happened. It's next Sunday as is the battle."

"Look as if nothing had happened!—and why should I wish to stay in Carlingford, or—or anywhere?" cried Vincent, in a fantastic outbreak of dejection. But he threw down his pen, and closed his blotting-book over the half-written letter. He was too wretched to have much resolution one way or another. To argue the matter was worse than to suffer any consequences, however hard they might be.

"I don't deny it's natural as you should feel strange," admitted Tozer. "I do myself, as am only your friend, Mr. Vincent, when folks are a-talking in the shop, and going over one thing and another—what relation she is to the minister, and how she came to be left all alone, and how a minister's daughter ever come to know the likes of him—"

"For heaven's sake, no more, no more!—you will drive me mad!" cried Vincent, springing to his feet. Tozer, thus suddenly interrupted, stared a little, and then changed the subject, though without quite finding out how it was that he had startled his sensitive companion into such sudden impatience. "When I was only telling him the common talk!" as he said to his wife in the privacy of their own parlour. In the mean time he had other subjects equally interesting.

"If you'll take my advice, you'll begin your coorse all the same," said Tozer; "it would have a good effect, that would. When folks are in a state of excitement, and a-looking for something, to come down upon them as before, and accordin' to intimation, would have a wonderful effect, Mr.

Vincent. You take my word, sir, it would be very telling—would that. Don't lose no time, but begin your coorse as was intimated. It's a providence, is the intimation. I wouldn't say nothing about what's happened—not plain out; but if you could bring in a kind of an inference like, nothing has had anything to do with your sister, but just as might be understood—"—*Ibid.* pp. 338, 339.

We are not disposed to believe that any congregation of men and women would, under the awful circumstances, hold their minister so rigidly to the previous 'intimation;' but when reality and melodrama clash it is always the real that must give way. Vincent, stimulated by excitement, satisfies Mr. Tozer by his sermon, but undoes all by leaving the vestry precipitately, just when the malcontents, deacons, committee, and all, were breaking in with a little address of thanks and sympathy. Henceforth Pigeon and Brown were implacable, though Tozer still fought for him. 'And now, ma'am,' he says to the mother,

"I'll go on to the minister and see if there's anything as he'd like me to do, for Pigeon and the rest was put out, there's no denying of it; but if things is set straight directly, what with this news, and what with them sermons yesterday, I don't think as it'll do no harm. I said to him, as this Sunday was half the battle," said the worthy buttermilk, reflectively; "and he did his best—I wouldn't say as he didn't do his best; and I'm not the man as will forsake my pastor when he's in trouble."—*Ibid.* p. 454.

Events happen between the two sermons to cheer the minister, and alter his whole tone of thought. The first sermon sounds sufficiently heterodox from its heads: the next, delivered a few hours after, is an effusion of faith. Under this change of feeling Vincent is induced to set out on a round of propitiatory visits, and for once he satisfies us by being civil to the Tozers; but on his way to Pigeons' his evil genius, Lady Western—who is innocently mixed up with his troubles, through her wicked brother—interposes. He calls upon her, and makes no more visits that day. As every movement of a popular preacher is watched, the cause of his dereliction is no secret. The breach widens, and at length a meeting is agreed on without his knowledge, with the purpose of carrying a vote of censure. Notice of it is delivered from his pulpit, and Vincent, already disgusted with the bondage of his position, and more and more alive to the evils of the system which fetters him, gives out another meeting for the following day. All Carlingford is represented to be astir. The writer brings all her powers to bear on this great occasion; nothing can be more able, spirited, and exciting than her management of the whole scene and the audience from Mrs. Vincent, who goes there hidden by her widow's veil, and to whom nothing is absurd or vulgar in proceedings so all-important to her son, the cynical Pigeons, the friendly Tozers, and the

vacillating multitude. The whole thing is quite a lesson, and shows a comprehension of the humours of a crowd, and the way to rule them, the want of which loses many a cause. First, Pigeon gets up, under strong professed sense of 'dooty,' to complain of the minister—not of his sermons, though they was not 'to call rousing up, but as far as the work of a congregation went. He might have held his peace, but things was come to that pass in Salem as a man had to do his dooty if he was to be 'took to the stake for it.' The allusion to the stake is highly characteristic of this style of oratory; but Pigeon had not the art of exciting violent feeling. Then stood up Mr. Tufton to plead for his young brother, trying his wife's nerves and patience by his clumsy mismanagement of the cause.

'Mr. Tufton did his young brother no good. He was so sympathetic over the misfortunes that had befallen Vincent's family, that bitter tears came to the widow's eyes, and her hands once more tightened in a silent strain of self-support.' While the old minister impressed upon his audience the duty of bearing with his dear young brother and being indulgent to the faults of his youth, it was all the poor mother could do to keep silent, to stifle down the indignant sob in her heart, and keep steady in her seat. * * *

'As for the other minister's wife, poor Mrs. Tufton's handkerchief dropped a great many times during her husband's speech. Oh, if these blundering men, who mismanage matters so, could but be made to hold their peace! Tears of vexation and distress came into the eyes of the good little woman. Mr. Tufton meant to do exactly what was right; she knew he did; but to sit still and hear him making such a muddle of it all! Such penalties have to be borne by dutiful wives. She had to smile feebly, when he concluded, to somebody who turned round to congratulate her upon the minister's beautiful speech. The beautiful speech had done poor Vincent a great deal more harm than Pigeon's oration. Salem folks, being appealed to on this side, found out that they had, after all, made great allowances for their minister, and that he had not on his part shown a due sense of their indulgence. Somebody else immediately after went on in the same strain; a little commotion began to arise in the quiet meeting. "Mr. Tufton's 'it it," said a malcontent near Mrs. Vincent; "we've been a deal too generous, that's what we've been; and he's turned on us." "He was always too high for *my* fancy," said another. "It ain't the thing for a pastor to be high-minded; and them lectures and things was never nothing but vanity; and so I always said."—*Ibid.* pp. 714, 715.

Things were going badly for Vincent. The spirits of the Tozer ladies flagged, the female Pigeons looked triumphant, Mrs. Vincent began to give up all for lost. It happened that shortly before this she had had a conversation with Tozer, and had diplomatically expressed her fears that her son, following the example of other clever young men impatient of interference, should 'throw it all up,' and renounce the ministry. The widow, like people who choose their arguments not so much for truth as for effect, had no real faith in it, but it assumed a form to Tozer,

and suggested his line on this great occasion. His speech is so able a comment on the working of Dissent, and bears out so forcibly what has been shown by sufferers from the system, and been brought forward by Church advocates in discussion with various branches of Nonconformists, that we are tempted to quote largely from it as a sort of summary of the whole question. He opens by complaining of a certain underhandedness in the attack, avowing his opinion that they are quarrelling with their bread-and-butter. Probably our readers will see the enormous advantage a man has, the door of eloquence opened, by simple freedom from the trammels of grammar and mere finical niceties of elocution:—

“Yes, ladies and gentlemen! them’s my sentiments! *we don’t know when we’re well off!* and if we don’t mind, we’ll find out how matters really is when we’ve been and disgusted the pastor, and drove him to throw it all up. Such a thing ain’t uncommon; many and many’s the one in our connexion as has come out for the ministry, meaning nothing but to stick to it, and has been drove by them as is to be found in every flock—they as is always ready to dictate—to throw it all up. My friends, the pastor as is the subject of this meeting”—here Tozer sank his voice, and looked round with a certain solemnity—“Mr. Vincent, ladies and gentlemen, as has doubled the seat-holders in Salem in six months’ work, and, I make bold to say, brought one-half of you as is here to be regular at chapel, and take an interest in the connexion—Mr. Vincent, I say, as you’re all collected here to knock down in the dark, if so be as you are willing to be dictated to—the same, ladies and gentlemen, as we’re a-discussing of to-night—told us all, it ain’t so very long ago, in the crowdedest meeting as I ever see, in the biggest public hall in Carlingford—as we weren’t keeping up to the standard of the old Nonconformists, nor showing, as we ought, what a voluntary Church could do. It ain’t pleasant to hear of, for us as thinks a deal of ourselves; but that is what the pastor said, and there was not a man as could contradict it. Now, I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, what is the reason? It’s all along of this as we’re doing to-night. We’ve got a precious young man, as Mr. Tufton tells you, and a clever young man, as nobody tries for to deny; and there ain’t a single blessed reason on this earth why he shouldn’t go on as he’s been a-doing, till, Salem bein’ crowded out to the doors (as it’s been two Sundays back), we’d have had to build a new chapel, and took a place in our connexion as we’ve never yet took in Carlingford!”—*Ibid.* pp. 716, 717.

It is a great thing in popular speaking to have one object, the mind concentrated on one point, and Salem was this centre in our orator; all knotty questions of discipline and doctrine merging in the one necessity to fill the chapel and make an imposing appearance. It was not so very different with Vincent, only he was his own Salem.

“But it ain’t to be,” said Tozer, looking round him with a tragic frown, and shaking his head slowly. “Them as is always a-finding fault, and always a-setting up to dictate, has set their faces again’ all that. It’s the way of some folks in our connexion, ladies and gentlemen: a minister

ain't to be allowed to go on building up a chapel, and making hisself useful in the world. He ain't to be left alone to do his dooty as his best friends approve. He's to be took down out of his pulpit, and took to pieces behind his back, and made a talk and a scandal of to the whole connexion! It's not his preaching as he's judged by, nor his dooty to the sick and dyin', nor any of them things as he was called to be pastor for; but it's if he's seen going to one house more nor another, or if he calls often enough on this one or t'other, and goes to all the tea-drinkings. My opinion is," said Tozer, suddenly breaking off into jocularly, "as a young man as maybe isn't a marrying man, and anyhow can't marry more nor one, ain't in the safest place at Salem tea-drinkings; but that's neither here nor there. If the ladies haven't no pity, us men can't do nothing in that matter; but what I say is this," continued the buttermilk, once more becoming solemn; "to go for to judge the pastor of a flock, not by the dooty he does to his flock, but by the times he calls at one house or another, and the way he makes hisself agreeable at one place or another, ain't a thing to be done by them as prides themselves on being Christians and Dissenters. It's not like Christians—and if it's like Dissenters the more's the pity. It's mean, that's what it is," cried Tozer, with fine scorn; "it's like a parcel of old women, if the ladies won't mind me saying so. It's beneath us as has liberty of conscience to fight for, and has to set an example before the Church folks as don't know no better. But it's what is done in our connexion," added the good deacon with pathos, shaking his forefinger mournfully at the crowd. "When there's a young man as is clever and talented, and fills a chapel, and gives the connexion a chance of standing up in the world as it ought, here's some one as jumps up and says, 'The pastor don't come to see me,' says he—the pastor don't do his duty—he ain't the man for Salem.' And them as is always in every flock ready to do a mischief, takes it up; and there's talk of a change, and meetings is called, and—here we are! Yes, ladies and gentlemen, here we are! We've called a meeting, all in the dark, and give him no chance of defending himself; and them as is at the head of this movement is calling upon us to dismiss Mr. Vincent. But let me tell you," continued Tozer, lowering his voice with a dramatic intuition, and shaking his forefinger still more emphatically in the face of the startled audience, "that this ain't no question of dismissing Mr. Vincent; it's a matter of disgusting Mr. Vincent, that's what it is—it's a matter of turning another promising young man away from the connexion, and driving him to throw it all up. You mark what I say. It's what we're doing most places, us Dissenters; them as is talented and promisin', and can get a better living working for the world than working for the chapel, and won't give in to be worried about calling here and calling there—we're a-driving of them out of the connexion, that's what we're doing! I could reckon up as many as six or seven as has been drove off already. . . . It shall never be said in our connexion as a clever young man was drove away from Carlingford, and I had part in it. There's the credit o' the denomination to keep up among the Church folks—and there's the chapel to fill, as never had half the sittings let before—and there's Mr. Vincent, as is the cleverest young man I ever see in our pulpit, to be kep' in the connexion; and there ain't no man living as shall dictate to me or them as stands by me! Them as is content to lose the best preaching within a hundred miles, because the minister don't call on two or three families in Salem, not as often as they would like to see him," said Tozer, with trenchant sarcasm, "can put down their names again' Mr. Vincent; but for me, and them as stands by me, we ain't a-going to give in to no such dictation: we ain't a-going to set up ourselves against the spread of the Gospel, and the credit o' the connexion, and toleration and freedom of

conscience, as we're bound to fight for! If the pastor don't make hisself agreeable, I can put up with that—I can; but I ain't a-going to see a clever young man drove away from Salem, and the sittings vacant, and the chapel falling to ruin, and the Church folks a-laughing and a-jeering at us, not for all the deacons in the connexion, nor any man in Carlingford. And this I say for myself and for all as stands by me!"—*Ibid.* pp. 717, 718.

The effect of these arguments is conclusive. The meeting—except the minority of malcontents, cruelly identified 'as them as likes to dictate'—awake to the fact of Vincent's merit. The meeting of inquiry turns into an ovation. But Vincent has made up his mind. Not all Tozer's private entreaties, not an address of sympathy, not the offer of 50*l.* increase of salary and a piece of plate, can turn him from his resolution of throwing it up, and the widow sees the phantom she has conjured up turn into an obstinate reality. There is something quite pathetic in Tozer's efforts to keep Vincent in his place; but these we must leave the reader to follow for himself. Vincent retires from his labours in the ministry, leaves Carlingford, and sets up a philosophical review, having first given his views on the nature of his own ordination as the conclusion of his speech:—

"Wait before you applaud me," said the Nonconformist. "I have said nothing that calls for applause. I have something more to tell you—more novel than what I have been saying. I am going to leave Carlingford. It was you who elected me, it is you who have censured me, it was you last night who consented to look over my faults, and give me a new trial. I am one of those who have boasted in my day that I received my title to ordination from no bishop, from no temporal provision, from no traditionary Church, but from the hands of the people. Perhaps I am less sure than I was at first, when you were all disposed to praise me, that the voice of the people is the voice of God; but, however that may be, what I received from you I can but render up to you. I resign into your hands your pulpit, which you have erected with your money, and hold as your property. I cannot hold it as your vassal. If there is any truth in the old phrase which calls a church a cure of souls, it is certain that no cure of souls can be delegated to a preacher by the souls themselves who are to be his care. I find my old theories inadequate to the position in which I find myself, and all I can do is to give up the post where they have left me in the lurch. I am either your servant, responsible to you, or God's servant, responsible to Him—which is it? I cannot tell; but no man can serve two masters, as you know. Many of you have been kind to me—chief among all," said Vincent, turning once round to look in Tozer's anxious face, "my friend here, who has spared no pains either to make me such a pastor as you wished, or to content me with that place when he had secured it. I cannot be content. It is no longer possible. So there remains nothing but to say good-bye—good-bye!—farewell! I will see you again to say it more formally. I only wish you to understand now that this is the decision I have come to, and that I consider myself no longer the minister of Salem from this night."—*Ibid.* pp. 78, 79.

Into the story as a story we have not entered ; it is, however, romantic and eventful enough to engage the interest of the class called novel-readers, who may not be alive to the attractions of Mr. Tozer. The whole book is written with a fervour and thorough possession of the subject which compels the reader's attention and sympathy. All the characters are real to the authoress. She labours to make them such to ourselves from a joint energy of fancy and memory. If she is one-sided in some of her delineations of Dissent and its workings, it is from no common-place prejudice, but from some experience in which her heart was engaged. It is impossible to enter into such a character as Tozer's without feeling that in the present state of our middle classes (as the term is often understood) Dissent opens a field for talent and energy more congenial to their education and general tone of feeling than our Church presents, except in rare and exceptional cases. We do not say that it is desirable that men should meddle in matters above their handling, and so be driven to lower the subject to better keeping with their mode of treatment ; but wherever there is power and desire to be useful there must be some legitimate application for them in the cause of religion and hearty religious fellowship ; in which last so many a Church congregation fails—fails in a sense of union and joint action. It would be a very legitimate point for the worshippers in our town churches to aim at, that of filling the benches though they may not let them, and of exhorting each other to liberal collections, though they may not assume the distribution of them. Many a good man of business, whose thought and interest in the Church are now confined to the Sunday hours of service, might be stirred into more active co-operation, if there was a machinery which would give him some authorized place ; and the increase of activity and life might well atone for some fussiness and even faulty taste in the doing it. These are vague thoughts. It is one thing to feel a want, and another to suggest a remedy that would not be worse than the original disease. But many of our readers will, we believe, share with us in the wish, that the 'flower of the middle classes' in *our* connexion were stimulated into a zeal as real, but purer, better regulated, and under more effectual control, than that which prompted to such signal action the master-spirit of 'Salem Chapel.'

- ART. VIII.—1. *Warnings and Consolations spoken in St. Barnabas Church, Pimlico.* By the Rev. JAMES SKINNER. London: Mozley. 1857. ('Eternal Punishment,' p. 146.)
2. *Caroli Passaglia de Aeternitate Pœnarum deque Igne Inferno Commentarii.* Ratisbonæ (1854): Manz.
3. *Letters on the Evidences, &c.* By OLINTHUS GREGORY, LL.D. Ninth Edition. London: 1857. Bohn. (Letter XXI: 'On Eternal Existence after Death.')
4. *Études Philosophiques sur le Christianisme.* Par AUGUSTE NICOLAS. 7ième Édit. Paris: Vaton. 1851. ('De l'Enfer.' 2nde Partie; Chap. viii.)
5. *Some Points of Christian Doctrine considered with Reference to certain Theories put forth by the Right Hon. Sir J. Stephen, K.C.B. LL.D.* By WILLIAM BONNER HOPKINS, M.A. Fellow and Tutor of S. Catharine's Hall, Cambridge. Cambridge: Deighton. 1849.
6. *Cartas a un Esceptico en Materia de Religion.* Por Don Jaime Balmes, Presbitero. Paris: Libreria de Rosa y Bouret. 1853. (Carta iii.)
7. *Eternal Life or Eternal Punishment.* Penny Tracts. No. 15. Dublin Tract Repository. 'The Eternal Misery of Hell.' By Rev. JAMES SAURIN. Published by the American Tract Society. No. 277.

THERE is spreading over a portion of civilized Europe, as there has already spread over a portion of civilized America, a doctrine commonly entitled *Universalism*. The purport of this doctrine is, that all men will ultimately be saved. There appear, however, to be some persons in Great Britain who declare that they are not absolutely Universalists, although they agree with such in denying the Eternity of Future Punishment. On the degree of importance to be attached to this distinction, we shall have occasion to speak presently. But it will obviously cover the ground occupied by both these sections of thinkers, and by the numerous subdivisions existing among them, if we try once more to re-state some of the grounds on which that solemn and tremendous dogma rests. Such a task is not naturally an inviting one, nor ought any one

to undertake it, except under a most solemn call of duty. For their readers' sakes, as well as for their own, most surely ought such a subject to be treated, by those who undertake it, under the solemnity of the invocation *Benedicat Benedictus*.

The dogma which we have to consider is this, that there is a degree of hardness and impenitence of heart which is fraught with everlasting evil to those who wilfully persist in it; and that such obdurate sinners will ultimately be banished from the presence of God, and condemned to a state of misery that knows no end.

Upon the details of this fearful condition, neither the Church of England nor the Church Universal has presumed to utter any formal or authoritative decision. The reality and the eternity of the misery is affirmed authoritatively; the precise nature and qualities of the sufferings, and the nature and locality of the place where they are to be endured, are open questions—matters of opinion, not of faith.

Next to the consideration of the doctrine itself comes that of the persons for whom we are trying to write. A brief essay upon a single subject must necessarily involve assumptions upon many points. We hasten, therefore, to declare that these pages are not addressed to Atheists or to Deists, to Pantheists or Arians (much less Socinians), or even to those avowed Latitudinarians who consider that Holy Scripture is devoid of all definite meaning whatsoever. Such must look elsewhere for argumentation against their respective forms of error. We base our present reasonings upon faith in the One God, the Trinity in Unity, infinitely powerful, wise, and good; upon faith in the Incarnation and Atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ; faith in the Scripture, as the impress of the mind of the Holy Spirit in all things requisite to salvation. In making this last-named assumption, we include very specially a belief in the existence of the Holy Angels, as also of those fallen and apostate ones who have Satan as their head and captain. And, further, we shall consider ourselves at liberty to assume the correctness of one principle of *exegesis*, which is always cheerfully conceded to interpreters of writings upon secular subjects; we mean the principle of explaining obscure and doubtful passages by the light of those which are distinct and clear.

What we have to urge will be found, for the most part, to fall under one of the following heads:—I. The testimony of Holy Scripture. II. The *dicta* of commentators and theologians. III. The teaching of the heathen, and of others outside the pale of Christianity. IV. The grounds of objections

to the doctrine, and the probable causes of the temper which gives rise to those objections.

But before entering upon these various topics, we have to submit to the reader some reflections of a mixed and general character, which, although partially capable of being ranged under one or more of the above divisions, will be more fitly (and, we trust, more beneficially) introduced by themselves as preliminaries to the rest.

The first reflection which we would suggest to the earnest, thoughtful, prayerful consideration of the reader is the following. Here is a doctrine very terrible and overwhelming—a doctrine contrary to the hopes and imaginations of mankind, and, at the first glance, seemingly at variance with Christian ideas of the Divine mercy and benevolence. And yet, though it starts, so to speak, with all these disadvantages, we cannot point to any age, however remote, in which it can be said to have been unknown and untaught among the sons of men. It was known and believed in by God's ancient people; it was taught by Chaldeans, Egyptians, and Assyrians; it is openly proclaimed or implicitly assumed by many of the Greek and Roman writers, and among these by some of the wisest and most religious (even those who oppose it making large admissions, or else impugning in the same breath the very idea of a future existence at all); among avowed sceptics many have confessed their inability to rid themselves of it, most notably Diderot and Voltaire; it is not unheard of among savage tribes and remote islanders; it is taught in the Code of Manu, in the Puranas, and in the Koran; it is implied in the language of Isaiah and Ezekiel, of S. Paul and of S. John; and lastly, it is announced by our Blessed Lord Himself, in words so distinct, that their meaning can only be explained away by a criticism which would, in like manner, evacuate of all definite sense Revelation at large, and render the promise of eternal bliss to the redeemed equally vague and nugatory. On every occasion of its denial among Christians, that denial has met with instant rebuke; and in the present century, the sentiment (we believe a transitory sentiment) which runs counter to it in certain quarters, has evoked replies more profound and philosophic than those of any earlier age.

Now, we waive for the moment all consideration of that most solemn stamp of authority with which the above list was closed. We take our stand, for the present, on the ground of universality. 'That which all think, of that we affirm the existence,' says the Stagyrice. 'A point on which the sentiment of all men coincides, must of necessity be true,' repeats Cicero: *Ὁ πᾶσι δοκεῖ, τούτ' εἶναι φάμεν. de quo autem omnium*

*natura consentit, id verum esse necesse est.*¹ And here we find perhaps as close an approximation to universality and concurrence of sentiment as on any one article of belief whatever. The few exceptions, here and there, are just what we might anticipate—little more than illustrations of the principle that exceptions prove the rule. When, indeed, we consider how deep a personal interest we all have, as sinners, in denying the terrors of the Divine judgments, it is perhaps marvellous that the task has not been hitherto attempted more frequently and on a larger scale. But ignorant as we are of any doctrine to which the *dictum* of Aristotle and Cicero can be more strictly applicable, we must hold this consent to be a cogent proof, as of the Being of God and the endless bliss of Heaven, so likewise also of the unending misery of Hell.

We are writing for Christians; consequently, we need do no more than barely allude to the way in which the unbeliever attempts to rid himself of the oppression of this weight of testimony. 'It is all,' he says, 'priestcraft and kingcraft.' Truly strange priestcraft which has proved so successful in its conspiracy, that navigation has discovered no distant shore to which the fear of such dread destiny has not penetrated! Strange priestcraft which, even among many heathen, and certainly among Christians, denounces the worst forms of misery against unfaithful priests and teachers! And strange kingcraft, too, which has ever placed kings among the foremost and most conspicuous in the ranks of the reprobate! It is the great ruler Jehangir, who stands forward in Hindoo legends: it is a Sisyphus, a Tantalus, a Danaus, an Ixion, all kings or of royal race, who meet the eye as we gaze upon the poetic description of Tartarus. Religious heathen have ever, to their credit be it spoken, written upon this subject in the spirit of that striking passage in the Book of Wisdom, in which kings are warned that He who gave them sovereignty will try them with an especial rigour: 'Horribly and speedily shall He come upon you, for a sharp judgment shall be to them that be in high places. For mercy will soon pardon the meanest, but mighty men shall be mightily tormented.' Nor are there wanting similar hints to priests which suggest ideas like those of S. Chrysostom, when he declared his conviction of the far greater risk encountered by the teachers than the taught—warnings approximating to that which occurs in the Liturgy of Malabar: 'From everlasting to everlasting: the Altar is fire in fire: fire surrounds it: let Priests beware of the terrible and tremendous fire, lest they fall into it and be burnt for ever.' No: if unbelievers wish

¹ Aristot. Eth. Nicomach. Cic. de Nat. Deor., lib. 1. cap. 17, § 44.

to preserve even the semblance of reasonableness, they must find some more plausible way of accounting for so vast a *consensus* than the worn and, in this case, most inapplicable *dictum* about the craft of priests and kings.¹

Before passing onward to a second consideration, it is right to pause for a moment over the list of books which appears at the head of this article. There is scarcely one from which something may not be culled. Mr. Hopkins's reply to Sir J. Stephen is exceedingly well executed, the Spaniard Balmes is philosophic and suggestive, and Italy contributes valuable aid, especially in respect of Biblical criticism, in the short tractate by Father Passaglia. But the first and highest place must, in our judgment, be assigned to M. Nicolas. Nor is it a novel phenomenon in the history of the Church, that a layman should be peculiarly successful in the defence of revealed truth. To bring out into clear light a doctrine, which the Church has held implicitly, is the work of great doctors—a Leo, an Anselm, an Augustine. But in defending recognised truth, a layman has often the advantage of greater amount of intercourse with the world, and more extensive acquaintance with general literature, than his clerical contemporaries. Some of the best among the primitive apologists were laymen; as, for instance, S. Justin, Arnobius, and Lactantius.

It will readily be understood that, in making use of these works, we do not commit ourselves to more than the general approval of that part of them which concerns our present subject. For the sake of others who may wish to study the question still more deeply, we subjoin the names of some other books which we have not had an opportunity of consulting.²

¹ See Wisdom, chap. vi. 1—9, and Mr. Neale's translations of Primitive Liturgies (London: Hayes, 1859), p. 151. The warning of Hesiod to corrupt judges (*βασιλεις*), in his 'Works and Days' (lines 231—249), is very impressive. Cf. Plato *passim*, more especially the solemn apologue with which the Gorgias concludes. As regards *priests*, how much is implied in the single epithet attached to those whom Virgil places in Elysium with patriots, pious bards, and benefactors of their kind!—

'Quique sacerdotes casti, dum vita manebat.' (*Æn.* vi. 661.)

² An article on Eternal Condemnation, by Erbkam, in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1838, is pronounced by Bishop Ellicott to be 'long, difficult, but in many points satisfactory' (Note C on Sermon IV. in the 'Destiny of the Creature'). Passaglia mentions with approbation; Lauzerand, *Essai sur la doctrine du rétablissement final*, 1853; Dietelmair, *De ἀποκαταστάσει scripturariâ et fanaticâ*, 1746; Winzer, *De ἀποκαταστάσει in libris Nov. Test. propositâ*; Freundler, *Réfutation de la doctrine du rétablissement final*, Genève, 1850; J. L. Durand, *Le progrès dans la vie future*, 1851; Ed. Reuss *Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne au siècle apostolique*, l. iv. p. 257 sqq.; et P. Goy in op, *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie Chrétienne*, vol. vii. liv. vi. p. 370 sqq., Paris, 1853. . . . There is, if we mistake not, a Cambridge Hulsean Prize Essay on the subject, by Mr. (now the Rev.) G. M. Gorham. The ability and character of the author may warrant us in assuming its value to exceed the average standard of such youthful performances.

Of earlier works we do not speak, as these will be duly referred to in the course of our investigations.

The second consideration which we would urge upon the reader's attention, is the coherence of all revealed truth. It is common to imagine respecting many a doctrine, but most especially concerning this doctrine, that it may be quietly separated and dropped on one side, leaving the rest of the cycle of truth precisely where it was. But this is a serious mistake. And, as it cannot too often be protested against, we take the liberty of repeating a few remarks which appeared in this *Review* some eight years ago :—

'It is a leading characteristic of heresy, that after the denial of some one or more portions of saving truth, it imagines itself to hold the remainder in the same way as the mind of the Church—nay, very often, still more simply, clearly, firmly. Whereas, in reality, the truth which heretics still maintain, inevitably loses some vital portion of its character by its isolation from the accompanying dogmas to which it stood in a fixed and definite relation; it is held less firmly and completely than by the orthodox, who kept it in its due and proper place; it is held less clearly, and presents to the really enlightened and sanctified reason even greater difficulties than those which it strives to shun. The analogy of sounds and colours might serve to teach us this—these are not the same to the eye and ear when their relation is destroyed.

'Is not truth *one* and indivisible?
Take from the harmony a single tone—
A single tint take from the Iris bow,
And lo! what once was all, is nothing—while
Fails to the lovely whole one tint or tone!'¹

'If it be over-bold to term the residue *nothing* in such cases, we may yet say that it has become something very different from what it was.'²

To pretend that it is given to us, or indeed to any one in this mortal life, to fathom the depth of this connexion, would assuredly be most presumptuous. But, both on *à priori* grounds and from historical experience, we seem justified in asserting our capability of perceiving some links of connexion. One point stands forth conspicuous and prominent, in the closeness of its alliance with the dogma of Eternal Punishment—we mean the Atoning work of Christ, the Eternal Son of God, and our Saviour.

A great living divine of the English Church once told the

Of an article in this *Review* (January, 1854) on 'Maurice's Theological Essays,' the hostile but courteous *National Review* (January, 1863, p. 109) asserts that 'it presents the arguments for the doctrine of Endless Punishment as forcibly, perhaps, as they can be expressed.' The tracts of Dr. Jelf against Mr. Maurice, and Archbishop Whately's 'Scripture Revelations of a Future State,' have reached us too late for much use.

¹ Schiller (Sir E. B. Lytton's translation) *The Veiled Image at Saïs*.

² *Christian Remembrancer* for January, 1855.

writer how a layman, who at one time of his life had been imbued with Latitudinarian principles, was brought to the acceptance of this article of faith—not by direct meditation upon it, but by pondering upon the greatness of all that had been wrought and suffered for us by our Blessed Lord. ‘I am convinced,’ said this layman—‘I am convinced that Christ did not come down from above to save us from nothing.’ The same thought—as we have learnt from intercourse with others—has sunk very deeply into many minds. ‘It seems such a mighty machinery,’ was the expression of another highly-gifted friend, ‘if one may say so reverently, to have been put into operation, if it were only to save us from a temporary evil.’ ‘As for the imputation,’ writes M. Nicolas, ‘made against the Church, of having imagined, at her own will, the dogma of Hell, we reply, that this dogma is no mere excrescence and outwork in the system of Catholic truth; that it is, on the contrary, so rigorously bound up with the entire framework of this Divine system, and so thoroughly fundamental, that to hesitate in the slightest degree at its admission is to hesitate respecting the admission of all the other truths, and that to reject it is to reject all. To deny Hell is to deny Redemption; to deny Redemption is to deny the Salvation of the human race by the Cross of Jesus Christ—that is to say, the most adorable of all the proofs of love which Heaven could give to earth:—it is to deny, consequently, the groundwork of all those charitable institutions to which this example of a God dying for His creatures has given birth, and to dry up the source of all that is most winning, most consoling, most full of succour for humanity.’ Strong, and even abrupt and startling, as this language may seem at the first glance, we believe that, the more profoundly it is meditated upon, the more reasonable it will appear. Oh that those who imagine that they can dispense with belief in endless punishment, and yet retain their hold upon all the other articles of revealed truth, would but consider it well—would think whether, in denying the intensity of that peril from which Christ offers us safety, they may not (however unintentionally) be robbing Him of His glory, and ‘denying the Lord that bought them!’

Sadly and terribly consistent, most thoroughly logical and consequential, appear to us in this respect the disciples of Socinianism. Seeing in our Blessed Lord one who is no more than man, they, of course, reject the Atonement. But if sin has not needed any atonement, it cannot be anything so very serious; it is a venial thing, and repentance is enough to blot it out. Then the Being who forgives on these terms, is doubtless One who is simply and absolutely benevolent—One who is disposed to assign to all persons the greatest possible degree of happiness without

much regard to the behaviour of the recipients, and who cannot, therefore, intend to inflict eternal punishments on any.

How utterly this mere Theophilanthropism is at variance with the real principles of natural as well as of revealed religion, may appear in the course of our argument. At present, we content ourselves with suggesting this thought to any who may be inclined to fancy that they can detach the idea of hell from the cycle of Christian doctrine, and yet remain firm believers in other fundamental articles of faith—more especially in the Divinity of their Lord and Saviour.¹ Let such reflect upon the tenets of Socinians; let them bethink themselves: 'Here are men who have advanced from the denial of the Godhead of Christ to a disbelief in the eternity of future misery; am I sure that I may not be in danger of reversing the process—that I may not proceed from rejecting the idea of Endless Wrath upon the hopelessly impenitent to a denial of the Eternal Godhead of Him who loved me and gave Himself for me, that I might be rescued from the wrath to come?' That path, it seems to us, is but too easily trodden, if once entered upon. Bishop Ellicott has warned us against 'the strongly-developed tendencies of our own times towards humanitarian conceptions of the nature and work of our Divine Master.'² Such conceptions naturally lead many minds to Universalism; on the other hand, Universalism is, in the case of others, the road to quasi-Arian or Socinian theories. And thus the two views play into each other, and make shipwreck of men's belief, until at moments we are reminded only too keenly of the saddening words: 'Nevertheless, when the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?'

Thus much as regards the *universality* of the dogma we are engaged in upholding, and its *coherence with other portions of revealed truth*. We now pass to a *third* consideration, which is this: *The soul's conviction of its own undying nature*. Of course, in its fullest development, taken into conjunction with the Resurrection of the Body, this conviction is a result of the Gospel—of the teaching of Him who 'brought life and immortality to light.' It would not, however, be safe to deny, that in some shape (too often a distorted one) the Immortality of the Soul is a doctrine of natural religion.

Now, this truth has a close and intimate alliance with our present theme. The existence of such a conviction of endless

¹ The reader will find abundant matter for reflection on this head by referring to 'Butler's Analogy,' especially Part I. Chap. III.; and a grand discourse by Newman 'On Justice, as a Principle of Divine Governance,' in his Oxford University Sermons.

² Preface to Edition of S. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians.

existence, however acquired, tends to render the soul all but fearless of any suffering that is sure to come to an end at some time, and leave it in the enjoyment of peace and bliss. 'So keen,' writes Madame de Stael, 'is the attraction of the goods of this world, that it makes everything grow pale beside it—even the glory of a future state of being. A German philosopher, disputing with his friends, once exclaimed, "*I would give, to obtain such and such a thing, two million years of my eternal happiness*;" and,' adds the writer, 'he was singularly moderate in the sacrifice that he proposed.'¹ The justice of the comment is quite undeniable: the sacrifice proposed was inappreciably small. Any finite number whatever, as mathematicians rightly teach us, must needs be incommensurable with Infinity. What possible difference could it make to a soul just entering upon the certainty of endless and overwhelming bliss, to know that it had waited for it two millions of years? Nay, if even the waiting had been melancholy or painful, this would not, at such a moment, affect the soul, unless by contrast it made the happiness still more delightful. And that long interval of suffering would have been ever irradiated by the knowledge that it *must* come to an end. *Hope* would have been ever present; and there is deep meaning in that ancient legend of Pandora, which represented hope as remaining when all else was lost, and assuaging upon earth the toils and sorrows of man.

But hell, as has often been said, would not be hell if hope were present there. Justly does the poet represent it as *the one thing* which the inscription over the gate of the *Inferno* summons all who cross its threshold to relinquish—

'Lasciate ogni speranza, voi che 'ntrate.'

Bishop Butler has remarked upon the extraordinary capacity for suffering with which we are endowed in our bodies.² Two

¹ *Reflexions sur le suicide.* Cit. ap. M. Nicolas.

² 'Suppose we are capable of happiness and misery in degrees equally intense and extreme, yet we are capable of the latter for a much longer time beyond all comparison. We see men in the tortures of pain for hours, days, and (excepting the short suspensions of sleep) for months together, without intermission; to which no enjoyments of life do, in degree and continuance, bear any sort of proportion.'—Sermon VI. on Compassion. To prevent misconception, the writer may state that he does not question the correctness of the ordinary belief that future misery includes pain of body as well as of soul. Such conclusion seems to follow, (1) as the most natural interpretation of the language of Scripture; (2) from the doctrine of the resurrection of the body and the analogy of the happiness of the redeemed; (3) from what we know of the effect of mental distress upon the body. . . . All that is here asserted is, that the *bodily* suffering has not been laid down as an article of absolute faith by any decree of the English Church, or of an Ecumenical Council. The Church says endless condemnation, endless loss and misery; and this is assuredly enough for us to know and seek salvation from through Christ!

works of imagination of our own day bring before us, in a remarkably vivid manner, the existence of the same capacity in our *minds*. We refer to Mr. Browning's poem of 'Easter Day,' and Dr. Newman's tale of 'Callista.' Amidst abundance of suggestive thoughts, the poet's lines especially enforce, and help us to realize, the ideas of a time when probation is past and over; and the dreary sense of desolation that would fall upon a soul which should have the whole of God's universe granted to it to revel in, but the sense of His gracious presence everywhere withdrawn, with love (too late sought for) now rendered an impossibility. We can only find room for a few disjointed passages—

'There stood I found and fixed, I knew,
Choosing the world. The choice was made,
 And naked and disguiseless stayed,
 And unevadeable, the fact.'

* * * * *

'A Voice
 Beside me spoke thus: "All is done;
 Time ends, Eternity's begun,
 And thou art judged for evermore."'

* * * * *

'This world,
 This finite life thou hast preferred,
 In disbelief of God's own word,
 To Heaven and to Infinity.'

The spirit is then dowered with the possession of the world, that he may for ever enjoy its scenery. He clutches eagerly at the gift—

'The austere Voice returned:
 "So soon made happy? Hadst thou learned
 What God accounteth happiness,
 Thou wouldst not find it hard to guess
 What hell may be His punishment
 For those who doubt if God invent
 Better than they. Let such men rest
 Content with what they judged the best,
 Let the unjust usurp at will:
 The filthy shall be filthy still:
 Miser, there waits the gold for thee!
 Hater, indulge thine enmity!
 And thou whose heaven, self-ordained,
 Was to enjoy earth unrestrained,
 Do it! Take all the ancient show!
 The woods shall wave, the rivers flow,
 And men apparently pursue
 Their works, as they were wont to do,
 While living in probation yet."'

And it is explained that all this glory was intended as a mere antechamber of the royalties in store for the children of the true

wisdom, and that it will inevitably fail to satisfy. The excluded spirit turns for a refuge to Art; but a like warning is at hand. The ideal aimed at by the painter and the sculptor was but a glimpse of the visions which their glorified nature will enjoy; and the soul's hunger, though sated for a season with such food, can only find its satisfaction in Paradise.

But there are other precious gifts of mind besides those expended on the study of nature or of art. There remain Philosophy, History, Poetry. These, too, are tried in the balance and found wanting; until at last, despondent and despairing, the spirit makes choice of Love. The answer seems to us overwhelming, and worthy of the deepest pondering—

' I fell prone, letting Him expend
His wrath, while thus the inflicting Voice
Smote me. " Is this thy final choice ?
Love is the best ? 'Tis somewhat late !
And all thou dost enumerate
Of power and beauty in the world,
The mightiness of Love was curled
Inextricably round about.
Love lay within it and without,
To clasp thee—but in vain ! Thy soul
Still shrunk from Him who made the whole,
Still set deliberate aside
His love !—Now take Love. Well betide
Thy tardy conscience ! Haste to take
The show of love for the name's sake,
Remembering every moment Who,
Beside creating thee unto
These ends, and these for thee, was said
To undergo Death in thy stead
In flesh like thine : so ran the tale.
What doubt in thee could countervail
Belief in it ? Upon the ground
That in the story had been found
Too much love ! How could God love so ?
He who in all His works below
Adapted to the needs of man,
Made Love the basis of the plan,
Did love, as was demonstrated :
While man, who was so fit, instead,
To hate, as every day gave proof—
You thought man, for his kind's behoof,
Both could and would invent that scheme
Of perfect love—'twould well beseem
Cain's nature thou wert wont to praise.
Not tally with God's usual ways ! "

XXXI.

' And I cowered deprecatingly—
" Thou Love of God ! Or let me die,
Or grant what shall seem Heaven almost !
Let me not know that all is lost,

Though lost it be—leave me not tied
 To this despair, this corpse-like bride !
 Let that old life seem mine—no more—
 With limitation as before,
 With darkness, hunger, toil, distress.
 Be all the earth a wilderness !
 Only let me go on, go on,
 Still hoping, ever and anon,
 To reach one eve the Better Land ! ”

The passage in Dr. Newman's tale (and, as throughout this paper, we confine ourselves to the approval of what we quote), is the account of a supposed conversation between Cæcilius, *i.e.* S. Cyprian, and the imaginary Greek maiden Callista. Dr. Newman is far too original a thinker to have borrowed from Mr. Browning, whose poem—though some years prior in point of publication—he may probably have never seen. The main ideas, however, in both appear to us to display a very close resemblance to each other ; but as the matter is so important, and the later writer has the advantage in clearness and directness, we venture to transfer to our pages this most striking dialogue. [We are partially responsible for the italics] :—

“ Well, its *maxims* are too *beautiful* to be believed ; and then, on the other hand, its *dogmas* are too dismal, too shocking, too odious to be believed. They revolt me.”

“ Such as what ? ” asked Cæcilius.

“ Such as this,” answered Callista. “ Nothing will ever make me believe that all my people have gone, and will go to an eternal Tartarus.”

“ Had we not better confine ourselves to something more specific and more tangible ? ” asked Cæcilius, gravely. “ I suppose, if one individual may have that terrible lot, another may, both may, many may. Suppose I understand you to say, that you will never believe that *you* will go to an eternal Tartarus ? ”

“ Callista gave a slight start, and showed some uneasiness or displeasure.

“ Is it not likely,” continued he, “ that you are better able to speak of yourself, and to form a judgment about yourself, than about others ? Perhaps, if you could first speak confidently about yourself, you would be in a better position to speak about others also ! ”

“ Do you mean,” she said, in a calm tone, “ that my place, after this life, is an everlasting Tartarus ? ”

“ Are you happy ? ” he asked, in turn.

“ She paused, looked down, and in a deep clear voice, said, “ No.” There was a silence.

“ The priest began again : “ Perhaps you have been growing in unhappiness for years—is it so ? You assent. You have a heavy burden on your heart—you don't well know what ; and the chance is, that you *will* grow in unhappiness for the next ten years to come. You will be more and more unhappy, the longer you live. Did you live till you were an old woman, you would not know how to bear your existence.”

“ Callista cried out, as if in bodily pain, “ It is true, sir, whoever told you ; but how can you have the heart to say it, to insult and mock me ? ”

“ God forbid ! ” exclaimed Cæcilius ; “ but let me go on. Listen, my child. Be brave, and dare to look at things as they are. Every day adds

to your burden. This is a law of your present being, somewhat more certain than that which you just now so confidently asserted, the impossibility of believing in that law. You cannot refuse to accept what is not an opinion, but a fact. *I say this burden which I speak of is not simply a dogma of our creed, it is an undeniable fact of nature.* You cannot change it by wishing; if you were to live on earth two hundred years, it would not be reversed—it would be more and more true. At the end of two hundred years you would be too miserable for your worst enemy to rejoice in it."

'Cæcilius spoke as if half in soliloquy or meditation, though he was looking towards Callista. The contrast between them was singular: he thus abstracted; she, too, utterly forgetful of self, but absorbed in him, and showing it by her eager eyes, her hushed breath, her anxious attitude. At last she said, impatiently, "Father, you are speaking to yourself; you despise me."

'The priest looked straight at her with an open, untroubled smile, and said, "Callista, do not doubt me, my poor child: you are in my heart. I was praying for you shortly before you appeared. No; but in so serious a matter as attempting to save a soul, I like to speak to you in my Lord's sight. I am speaking to you—indeed I am—my child; but I am also pleading with you in His behalf, and before His throne."

'His voice trembled as he spoke, but he soon recovered himself. "Suffer me," he said. "I was saying, that if you lived five hundred years on earth, you would but have a heavier load on you as time went on. But you will not live, you will die. Perhaps you will tell me you will then cease to be. I don't believe you think so. I may take for granted that you think with me, and with the multitude of men, that you will still live, that you *will* still be *you*. You will still be the same being, but deprived of those outward stays and reliefs and solaces which, such as they are, you now enjoy. You will be yourself, shut up in yourself. I have heard that people go mad at length, when placed in solitary confinement. If then, on passing hence, you are cut off from what you had here, and have only the company of yourself, I think your burden will be, so far, greater, not less, than it is now."

"Suppose, for instance, you still had your love of conversing, and could not converse; your love of the poets of your race, and no means of recalling them; your love of music, and no instrument to play upon; your love of knowledge, and nothing to learn; your desire of sympathy, and no one to love; would not that be still greater misery?"

"Let me proceed a step further: supposing you were among those you actually did *not* love; supposing you did *not* like them, nor their occupations, and could not understand their aims; suppose there be, as Christians say, one Almighty God, and you did not like Him, and had not taste for thinking of Him, and no interest in what He was and what He did; and supposing you found that there was nothing else anywhere but He, whom you did not love, and whom you wished away; would you not be still more wretched?"

"And if this went on for ever, would you not be in great inexpressible pain, for ever?"

"Assuming then, first, that the soul ever needs external objects to rest upon: next, that it has no prospect of any such when it leaves this visible scene; and thirdly, that the hunger and thirst, the gnawing of the heart, where it occurs, is as keen and piercing as a flame; it will follow, there is nothing irrational in the notion of an eternal Tartarus."

"I cannot answer you, sir," said Callista; "but I do not believe the dogma on that account a whit the more. My mind revolts from the notion. There *must* be some way out of it."

"If, on the other hand," continued Cæcilius, not noticing her interruption—"if all your thoughts go one way: if you have needs, desires, aims, aspirations, all of which demand an Object, and imply, by their very existence, that such an Object does exist also; and if nothing here does satisfy them, and if there be a message which professes to come from that Object, of whom you already have the presentiment, and to teach you about Him, and to bring the remedy you crave! and if those who try that remedy say, with one voice, that the remedy answers: are you not bound, Callista, at least, to look that way, to inquire into what you hear about it, and to ask for His help, if He be, to enable you to believe in Him?"

"This is what a slave of mine used to say," cried Callista, abruptly . . . "and another, Agellius, hinted the same thing . . . What is your remedy, what your Object, what your love, O Christian teacher? Why are you all so mysterious, so reserved in your communications?"

Cæcilius was silent for a moment, and seemed at a loss for an answer. At last he said, "Every man is in that state which you confess of yourself. We have no love for Him who alone lasts. We love those things which do not last, but come to an end. Things being thus, He whom we ought to love has determined to win us back to Him. With this object, He has come into His own world, in the form of one of us men; and in that human form, He opens His arms, and woos us to return to Him, our Maker. This is our worship, this our love, Callista."¹

On the due position of fear, as an ingredient in our nature, we will try to speak before we close. At present, let it be said that, though inferior to hope, and far, far inferior to love, no Christian man will question but that it has its appointed place. 'Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men,' says the Apostle. 'And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do; but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear Him, which after He hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear Him.'"

Most thoroughly, as has already been intimated, do we agree with those who maintain the impossibility of such fear being felt by the generality of mankind, if once they could convince themselves (as, happily for the interests of truth and the good of their own souls, few, if any, are able to do) that future punishment was in *their* case to be but temporary. We have spoken of the connexion between the Incarnation and the dogma of Eternal Loss. Let us add, that there exists a no less

¹ One of the first among living physicians gave us the following narrative:—A sempstress, careless about religion, was sitting up alone at two or three in the morning hard at work. The roar of some noisy and dissolute revellers suddenly fell upon her ear. Shocked at their expressions and brutalized mirth, she was struck by the thought, 'What if I had to live with such! what if I were to be condemned to live with them for ever!' This reflection haunted her mind, and she was at length brought to seek Christ. Is not this something like a comment on the sentiments of the imaginary Callista? How many souls may have thus been led to seek grace! How many may the poison of Universalism be turning aside from such a course!

² 2 Cor. v. 11; S. Luke xii. 4, 5.

intimate connexion between this dogma and the Christian's inner life. Disbelief in it is calculated not merely to modify, but to revolutionize our entire bent of thought and practice. We are sure that a very slight degree of self-examination will bring home to the breasts of many of our readers the correctness of this assertion. Let them calmly and soberly ask themselves the question, 'If the fear of eternal punishment were entirely removed, should I be in thought and deed the same person that I now am?' Very saintly, or else utterly hardened, must those be who can answer such an inquiry in the affirmative.

There are some other general considerations which deserve a place in this introductory portion of our paper, but which can only here be suggested, and must be left for our readers to reflect upon and develop at their leisure. There is, for example, the thought concerning the nature of that Being, against whom our sins are committed: a consideration which, in our judgment, has been unwisely and unduly pressed by Aquinas, and perhaps by others, but which is not on that account wholly to be laid aside. We do not, however, dwell upon it here, because, though most intimately interwoven with the formation of penitential love out of mere self-abhorrence, it has always seemed to us less closely allied to our present theme. Enough at present to remind the reader that offences are rendered the more grievous by the consideration of the dignity of Him who is offended, and of the good that He has done to us. *Here* He who is offended is the Infinite God—our Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier, the Author of all our good; and we have wilfully done despite to His Majesty, Gentleness, and Love.

Nor is it unimportant to observe (with S. Augustine, Bishop Butler, and Balmes) that to fix a point at which probation ends, is a right claimed and exercised by every civil government upon earth. All civil authority draws some line, the transgression of which, as by the rebel or the murderer, entails complete and final severance from the gift of earthly life and its enjoyments. Can we reasonably and religiously deny to the Sovereign Lord of all things a right which the overwhelming majority of men concede to His delegates upon earth? One difference, indeed, there is which needs to be borne in mind: civil government takes no account of repentance. The man condemned to death by the laws of his country, say for the crime of murder, will not be rescued from his temporal fate by the exhibition of sorrow during the interval that elapses between his sentence and its execution. Far, far otherwise is the criminal's position before his Almighty Judge. In that Court, sincere repentance is allowed to appropriate the inexhaustible

merits of the Redeemer, and He who, as the Righteous Judge, condemns and punishes the sin with temporal chastisement, deigns to plead in Heaven the cause of the sinner, who must one day stand before His most just, but most merciful, tribunal.

Moreover, we cannot wholly put out of sight the exceeding greatness of the prize which is offered by God to all who truly serve Him: 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him.' To every one of age to understand, is afforded grace enough to win some share of that everlasting bliss. But if when He calls they refuse; when He stretches out His hand they will not regard; then 'shall they eat of the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices.' 'The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.'¹

One more reflection, and we shall pass on to the more detailed inquiry that we have proposed. It will be found impossible to discover, outside the pale of Christendom, any *special* objection to the dogma of the Eternity of Punishment. It is immortality of *any* sort that (as a rule) was attacked by pagan impugnors of this teaching; and it may be safely affirmed that no *heathen* assailant ever dreamt of adducing those arguments against Tartarus, from the Divine goodness, which form the staple of modern scepticism on this head.

Whence arises this very singular phenomenon? Strange to say, it arises from the immense and only half-suspected influence of certain portions of the Christian revelation. Christianity has taught us so much, that had been before unimagined and undreamt of, respecting the Divine attributes of Love and Mercy; and these revelations are so acceptable to our weakness and consciousness of ill-desert; that we hail them gladly, and make them part of ourselves, and shut our eyes and ears to the constant evidence of a Justice which we choose to find incompatible with *our* imperfect notions of the Divine Compassion.

We must not pause to dwell upon the hollowness of this specious reasoning. We cannot do more than allude to the prominence of Justice, as in God's Word, from the first page to the last, so likewise even in heathen systems of Ethics. We can only hint at what has often been stated *in extenso*; namely, the insecurity of every other virtue (as even Cicero admits), if Justice be wanting.² Without it tenderness becomes mawkish

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 9, and Isa. lxiv. 4; Prov. i. 24—31; Rom. vi. 23.

² 'Fundamentum enim perpetuæ commendationis et famæ est Justitia; sine quâ nihil potest esse laudabile.'—Cic. de Officiis, lib. ii. cap. 20, § 71. In addition to references given in a former note, the writer may mention an admirable dis-

and mercy unmeaning. Without it, no individual human character is really grand; much less could any civilized community be held together for a day. And if we cannot trust our fellow-men to govern us, unless we believe that they are at least aiming at such an end, how were it possible to look up with adoring love and reverence to a Being, of whom we did not believe, in the very first place, that He was eminently and emphatically a God of Justice?

Those who serve Him the most truly, perceive this the most keenly. It is His victorious redeemed who sing: 'Great and 'marvellous are Thy works, Lord God Almighty; *just and true* 'are Thy ways, Thou King of Saints.' But even here on earth, an occasional glimpse into these solemn truths is vouchsafed—to some nearly always, to many in their better moments. There is food for deep thought in the declaration that has been made by several, that if it were proposed to them that all men should at once be pardoned as it were offhand, and set instantly free from the consequences of guilt, their sense of right would not be satisfied. Take any one great crime, and look at it in this light. A single instance will suffice: we take the first that happens to come to hand. In a note appended to the journal of Mrs. Trench, her son (the present Dean of Westminster) narrates what he justly stigmatizes as a crime of incredible baseness committed by the Prince Orloff, who had murdered the Russian Emperor, Peter III. There was living in retirement, in Italy, a daughter of the deceased Empress Elizabeth of Russia. The reigning sovereign, Catherine, did not like the idea of one so near the throne being thus out of her reach. Prince Orloff travelled to Italy, won the affections of this princess, and married her. He then brought her to Russia and delivered her into the hands of Catherine, who straightway threw her into a prison, from which she was never suffered to emerge. We ask, would any man with human feeling be *pleased* to think that this monstrous act of perfidious cruelty should remain wholly unpunished—that the offender should depart scotfree? Surely, the bare imagination of such a pardon is revolting to our whole moral sense! So far is it from being true, even of our fallen nature, with its faint and limited sense of the evil of sin, that we are able to endure the thought of mere indiscriminating mercy, unless supported and, as it were, balanced by the stern corrective of justice.

And if our minds have loved to dwell—as is most natural—

course preached (but not published) at Oxford from the University pulpit, in Michaelmas Term, 1861, by the Rev. E. Garbett. Cf. Plato *passim*, especially in the first two books of the 'Republic.' He calls Justice μέγιστον. Aristotle also, in a well-known passage, declares that all virtue is summarily (συνολήσθη) comprised in this single one.

too exclusively, or perhaps even solely, on the truths connected with that Divine mercy of which heathens knew comparatively so little, and to close our eyes to those not less clear and emphatic texts which announce God's threatened judgments, let us beware lest we be adding to our sins the guilt of ingratitude. The Cross of Christ reveals to us so much love, and inspires us with so much confidence, in great measure because it discloses a justice as infinite as is the love. The proof of the love consists in its having purchased us at so vast a price—in its having rescued us from hell by the death of Him who is God. Let us beware, then, lest in our acknowledgment of this sublime compassion, we unconsciously cherish a desire to evade the recognition of the no less infinite justice which demanded so infinite a ransom, and so fall into the sin of ingratitude. It is, of course, just conceivable that the sacrifice offered upon Mount Calvary might have been rendered capable of application to our souls in such wise, that nothing whatever should have been demanded upon our part; that we might have been left at liberty to sin, with the certainty of not falling into hell. In such case, having no interest in denying the existence of the everlasting fire 'prepared for the devil and his angels,' we should most probably have acquiesced without difficulty in the doctrine. But as there is imposed upon us the condition of faith, and of some measure of obedience and love, on our part, in order that the benefit of that all-sufficient Atonement may be applied to our own souls, we have a personal interest in denying the existence of these terrors, and a dread of having them forced upon our notice. And yet, as has already been implied, that would not be true goodness which should leave us free to sin; and the wicked, even if they might attain it, could not possibly be happy in heaven. 'Reflections of this kind,' says Bishop Butler, 'are not without terrors to serious persons the most free from enthusiasm, and of the greatest strength of mind; but it is fit things be stated and considered as they really are.'¹

Although in the foregoing considerations we have constantly referred to the *general* teaching of Holy Scripture, we have purposely refrained from coming to the more detailed question, respecting the eternity of future punishment—namely, *is it revealed?*

We were told, not long since, of one who, being about to quote Scripture on this subject, was stopped by the person

¹ Analogy, Part I. Chap. II. *sub fin.* In closing these prior considerations (which might, however, be much extended), we cannot acknowledge too fully or emphatically our obligations to M. Nicolas. In many places, whole sentences are all but literally translated from his admirable disquisition on this theme.

addressed: 'Oh, don't get quoting your Bible about it; I don't believe *that*.' With such we are not, at least in this part of our paper, at all concerned. We speak to those who do profess to believe the Bible: we speak to those who admit its authority respecting the world unseen. But if they appeal to what they are pleased to consider a higher light within them; if they have made up their minds beforehand not to accept anything which appears, at the first glance, to contradict their own imperfect notions of what is right and just; if they are predetermined to accept what they please, and to reject what they please; if they have previously resolved to receive the Scripture promises of endless bliss, but repel its threats of endless misery, then, of course, it is perfectly idle to enter into any examination of Scripture, because the case has already been prejudged.

Thus, for example, Bishop Colenso writes as follows respecting our own inward light:—

'By that light the sayings and doings of good men, the acts of the Church, the proceedings and decision of her Fathers and Councils, the writings of Prophets and Apostles, *the words recorded to have been uttered by our Blessed Lord Himself, must all be tried.* . . . But no seeming authority of the Church or Scripture *ought* [italics in original] to persuade a man to believe anything which contradicts that moral law, that sense of righteousness, and purity, and truth, and love, which God's own finger has written upon his heart. The voice of that inner witness is closer to him than any that can reach him from without, and ought to reign supreme in his whole being.'

Dear reader—if at this point we may venture so to address you—let us pause together for a moment over this matter before we proceed. Far be it from us to think meanly of that inward enlightenment which is vouchsafed in some degree by God to every man that cometh into the world, but most especially to those who have been renewed in Christ. But before you make this light the test and criterion of revealed truth, look well and heedfully that it has not been at all dimmed within you by sins of thought, or word, or deed. You see at once all in that Book which announces to you God's mercy. Your inward light at least can tell you that you have need of *that*. And may He, of His great goodness, forbid that any word in these pages should contravene those blessed and consoling revelations! Most thoroughly do we agree with the writer to whom we have referred so much—'that the most guilty man upon the whole earth has 'it yet in his power to commit one sin more flagrant than any 'that he has yet committed, and that is to despair of pardon.'²

¹ 'S. Paul's Epistles to the Romans, newly translated, and explained from a Missionary Point of View.' By the Right Rev. J. W. Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal (Macmillan, 1861), pp. 209, 210.

² With these golden words M. Nicolas concludes his chapter.

How, without such belief, could we bear to speak of His judgments?—how, without such acknowledgments, presume to write upon the subject of the most tremendous of them all?

But though Scripture so fully recognises the reality and importance of that inward light, does it tell nothing of the possibility of its lustre being lost in this or that individual soul? Is there nothing about the soul feeding on ashes, and the deceived heart unable to discern the lie in its right hand?—nothing about those who did not like to retain God in their knowledge, and were given over to a reprobate mind?—nothing concerning blind guides among those who should be teachers of the truth?—no warning against the evil eye that fills the whole body with darkness?—no hint that the very light within us *may* become darkness?¹ Are we so sure of the possession of that singleness of vision, so positive that we are untouched by the tendencies of the age in which we live, that we can dare to set our faint and imperfect conceptions of right against the clear and positive declarations of the Most High?

We say the clear and positive declarations. We refer to such words as those of our Lord, recorded in S. Matthew xxv. 46: 'And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the 'righteous into life eternal.' What plainer language could possibly be employed? What one article of the Christian faith is announced in terms more intelligible and distinct? How can we be properly said to believe in revelation at all, if we take upon ourselves to strike out so palpable and weighty a text; or if, with still greater inconsistency, we accept the latter half, but not the former? If anything could add to the strength of our conviction, that these words must be understood in their plain and obvious meaning, it would be the miserably sophistical criticism by which it has been sought to nullify their sense.

Thus, for example, a brilliant essayist not long since deceased asserted that *εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον*, 'might be rendered, with literal accuracy, either by the words "into lifelong punishment," or by the words, "into perpetual abscission."² This statement will not bear one moment's examination. If by 'abscission' the critic means 'annihilation,' then it must necessarily follow that some souls are *not* immortal, and he is contradicting one of the very first principles of all true religion. But if we take his other version, and make *αἰώνιος* only mean 'lifelong,' we are bound, by every principle of sound and honest

¹ Isa. xlv. 20; Rom. i. 21, 28; S. Matt. xxlii. throughout, and vi. 23. Abundance of similar passages will occur to every student of Scripture.

² Sir J. Stephen, 'Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography.' Epilogue, vol. ii. p. 492 (first edition).

criticism, to give to the word the same rendering in the latter part of the verse. And the text of S. Matthew (xxv. 46) ought in that case to stand thus in an English version: 'And these shall go away into lifelong punishment: but the righteous into lifelong life.' *Lifelong life!* This is the great reward promised by the Son of Man to those who are blessed of His Father; this the nature of the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world! Is it conceivable that a man of sense and intelligence could be induced to pen such criticism, if he were not at the moment under the dominion of a strong and over-mastering prejudice—if he were not anxious to force the plainest words into the trammels of a foregone conclusion?¹

Not less clear and significant is the language of S. Paul respecting the obdurate: 'Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power' (2 Thess. i. 9).

In the same direction tend, most unequivocally, all the passages that refer to the condition of the rebel angels. This is, indeed, a subject on which it is to be feared that there exists a widely-spread and (for the moment) a growing scepticism. It is, perhaps, the latest snare of Satan that he should strive to insinuate into men's minds a disbelief in his own existence. 'How pleased,' says Mr. Kingsley, 'the devil must be when he hears men talking in this way!' But as we cannot, in a single paper, embrace every topic, we must (as already intimated) assume that plain and obvious sense of God's Word which coincides with the teaching of natural religion—namely, that angels do exist; that by much the greater portion (a number, perhaps, far exceeding the entire human race) have ever continued to serve their Creator with a wellnigh perfect obedience, in unbroken holiness and love—wherefore we are taught to pray, 'Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth'—but that a portion sinned and kept not their first estate, and are condemned to everlasting punishment.

Those grounds of difference between the fall of Satan and the fall of man, which even *we* can perceive, have been pointed

¹ We must here express our obligations to Mr. Hopkins's excellent pamphlet (see list of works at the head of this article). Both Sir J. Stephen's and Mr. Hopkins's were duly criticised in the *Guardian* (1848, '49). There are reasons which prevent the present writer from expressing any opinion respecting those critiques, but he may venture to quote (from memory) one solemn sentence, which he knows to have been inserted by a different hand from that of the critic:—'Unless there be any other cure for sin but God's grace, and that cure be torment and hatred of God; then the punishment *must* be eternal, for He cannot change Himself, and He will not change them.'

out by many theologians; by none, perhaps, more clearly and acutely than by Aquinas. Man sinned, tempted from without: Satan and his host had no such excuse; man sinned, while absent from the immediate glory of the Divine presence, but Satan in the very courts of heaven; man sinned, and straight-way was ashamed and penitent, but the demons show no sign of true contrition: every hour they defy God, and add to their guilt by trying to mar His work, and render us as wicked as themselves. It seems possible that the will of an angel is more simple and unmixed than our frail and fluctuating wills, and that what such a spirit has once chosen, in that he must inevitably persist.¹

But if the reader believe what is taught respecting the condition of the fallen angels by the plain words of Scripture and the consent of almost every Christian community; if he does not, with the only too consistent Sadducee, say 'that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit,'² then he must admit that *some* part of God's creation is involved in a state of punishment from which no hope of liberation is held out. And what may happen to one creature may happen to another. We have wills, as they have; we can use them to defy God, as they have done; we, like them, can refuse to sue for mercy in our day of grace. And, in such case, we deliberately throw our lot with them, and must abide by the decision that we have made.

From the apostate angels we turn to men. The acceptance of any one great servant of God—as, for instance, the Apostle of the Gentiles—is of itself a pledge that numbers who are less highly gifted may yet be saved in the same way. 'There is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the Righteous Judge shall give me at that day; *and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing.*' But then, on the other side, it must, alas! be said, that the eternal loss of any one man is, in like manner, a proof that others may also be lost eternally. And of this possibility in a single instance, we must, in sorrow and awe, believe that we have a proof in the history of the traitor Judas Iscariot. Besides the terrible brand of that title, 'the son of perdition,' and the language employed respecting him in the Book of Acts, we read in S. Matthew our Lord's declaration, 'It had been good for that man if he had not been born.' But if chastisement be only temporary; if, at the end of a certain fixed period, he by whom the Son of Man was

¹ It is right to say that some great theologians decline to follow the Angelic Doctor in this view of the will of an angel. The writer does not see why Aquinas should not be right herein.

² Acts xxiii. 8.

betrayed, is to emerge into a state of endless happiness, then our Lord's words are surely *not* fulfilled: we cannot say that it is better for Judas that he had not been born.¹

And if other passages are more obscure (though there are several quite as plain as these), we repeat that, in accordance with every rule of sound criticism, we must interpret them, as we should do in a work of secular information, by the light thrown upon them from the texts which are most plain and evident. By the texts just cited, and by others of like character, we interpret the references to hell and future punishment made by Moses, by the Psalmist, by Isaiah, by Daniel, by S. John.² Nor is there the slightest reason to doubt but that the Jews believed in the punishment of the reprobate by a *second death*, and that an eternal one. The language of Ezekiel³ seems to imply thus much; and we do not find that, on this score, the Scribes or Pharisees made the slightest objection to the teaching of our Lord.

Further, on the negative side, we may remark on the absence of passages which favour the possibility of probation after this life. An American author, who (says Mr. Hopkins) 'cannot be suspected of treating this subject with prejudice or partiality,' observes:—'On this point I acknowledge that my convictions are strong. I have long searched with anxious solicitude for a text in the Bible which would even *seem* to favour the idea of a *future* probation. I cannot find it.' It is sometimes supposed that Roman Catholics believe probation to extend beyond this life; but this is quite a mistake. Although they differ from us respecting the intermediate state, they always teach that probation is ended upon earth.

And here we conclude for the present our *direct* references to Holy Scripture. We pause thus abruptly, not (*μὴ γένοιτο*) from underrating the importance of detailed examination, but from a conviction that the present opposition to the doctrine is very rarely based on such grounds. There are exceptions, of course; but in the great majority of instances that we have met with, either in converse or in books, the assailants appealed, *not* to the Bible, but to certain preconceived principles of their own.

¹ A clergyman of our Church, who pointed out to us the force of the text respecting Judas, had appealed to it in a controversy with a Socinian minister. The latter was silenced, but said afterwards that he shrunk from intercourse with one who held such terrible doctrines. Some years later this Socinian, being on his deathbed, sent for this very clergyman. The friends (!), however, of the dying man prevented a meeting. We believe that those who are faithful to their trust will again and again receive, sooner or later, such marks of confidence. Real peace and real joy will, in the long run, be found to coexist with truth alone.

² Deut. xxxii. 22; Ps. ix. 17; Isa. lxvi. 24; Dan. xii. 2; Apoc. xiv. 10, 11.

³ Ezek. xviii. 4, 20. Cf. on this point Mr. Hopkins's pamphlet.

If, however, any student of theology should wish to extend his studies in this direction, we would more especially recommend to his notice—

(1.) The pamphlet of Mr. Hopkins, to which we must render the most ample acknowledgments for many of the arguments contained in the last few pages.

(2.) The short Latin tractate of Passaglia. Apart from the evidence of style, this pamphlet of the Italian *Abate* might be bound up with the Latin treatises of Bishop Pearson or Bishop Bull. There is not, we believe, one word in it which they might not have written. (It is right to mention that the third section touches upon a perfectly open question; and on this point we are not wholly convinced by the author's reasonings.)

(3.) The ample dissertation against Whiston contained in the works of an able divine of the last century, Dr. Horbery.¹

(4.) The profound volume of discourses, by Bishop Ellicott, entitled, 'The Destiny of the Creature.' A careful study of this work, with the notes appended to it, will place the student in a position to test the value of many hasty speculations put forth by sciolists about Restitution and kindred themes.

II. In turning from Holy Scripture to those who have commented upon it, some leading features of importance arrest our attention at the very first glance. Such are, more especially, these following:—

1. The extraordinary amount of agreement on this head between those who in many respects are most strongly opposed to each other.

2. The extreme difficulty of finding any great number of *plain* and *consistent* impugnors of this doctrine, who are thoroughly trustworthy on the fundamental doctrines of Christianity; those, namely, of the Holy Trinity in Unity, and of the Incarnation and Atonement of Christ.

3. The extreme difficulty of making out what *is* meant to be taught by any impugnors of this dogma, who profess to stop short of Universalism.

Let us look at each of these features a little more in detail:—

1. It is almost a law of testimony, that difference on some points strengthens the weight of authority upon others. Such difference, of course, emerges most strongly since the Reformation. Well, let us take up the 'Catechism of the Council of Trent,' the 'English Prayer Book and Homilies,' the 'Westminster Confession,' the 'Confession of Augsburg: we

¹ Works, vol. ii. ed. Oxford, 1828. For this and for several patristic references, we have to thank the valuable note of Canon Wordsworth on S. Matt. xxv. 46.

have then before us the conclusions of Roman Catholics, Anglicans, Calvinists, Lutherans. They are herein all agreed. Turn to individual commentators. The Dutch Protestant Vitringa, and the learned Jesuit Cornelius à Lapide, speak in the same way on the concluding verses of Isaiah. Calvin and Maldonatus may wrangle fiercely over many passages in the Holy Gospels, but they have no contest over the meaning of such verses as we have just been quoting. In a word, it may be said that, with a very few and rare exceptions, we find on this solemn and mysterious dogma, a perfect *consensus* of Anglicans, Orientalists, Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, Schoolmen, Fathers, and Councils.

2. And to the next point we do beg our readers to pay a very special attention, because it may tend to shake that most false imagination, fostered by Sir J. Stephen and others, that men may reject this dogma and leave the rest of the Christian scheme untouched.

Subject, then, to the correction of more profound and laborious students, we avow that, in our own examination of this matter, *we have not been able to discover a single impugner of the dogma of eternal punishment who is consistent in his denial and at the same time orthodox.*

Grant, that we light upon a few words expressive of hope in Universalism uttered by S. Ambrose, by S. Gregory Nazianzen, and still more plainly by S. Gregory of Nyssa; still these great doctors, in other parts of their works, most expressly coincide with the general teaching of the Church. And when we consider how great and inexplicable a mystery it is, and how opposed to all the hopes and wishes of the natural man, the marvel really is, not that here and there a single voice falters, but that such hesitation should have been so rare, and that, in almost every case, it was silenced on some other occasion.¹

Most of those who thus faltered for a moment, did so under the influence of one great and resplendent name. Now, not all our regret for the doubt which Origen unhappily insinuated into men's minds on this question, shall induce us to forget his lofty and noble gifts, his lifelong labours in the cause of Christianity. Our feeling towards him is very much that mixed one, which has been expressed by Mr. Neale, in his 'History of the Eastern Church,' and also, very touchingly, by the author of 'The Cathedral—'

¹ A statement, with references and passages on both sides, is given by Petavius, Theol. Dogmat. (De Angelis, lib. iii. capp. vi. vii. viii.) The writer has by accident missed a sight of the passages in Hagenbach's 'History of Doctrine' (vol. i.), referred to by Bishop Ellicott.

'Into God's Word as in a palace fair
 Thou leadest on and on, while still beyond
 Each chamber, touched by holy Wisdom's wand,
 Another opes, more beautiful and rare,
 And thou in each art kneeling down in prayer,
 From link to link of that mysterious bond
 Seeking for Christ: *but oh, I fear thy fond
 And beautiful torch, that with so bright a glare
 Lighteth up all things, lest the heaven-lit brand
 Of thy serene philosophy divine
 Should take the colourings of earthly thought,
 And I, by their sweet images o'erwrought,
 Led by weak Fancy should let go Truth's hand,
 And miss the way into the inner shrine.*'¹

With all our affection for his memory, the truth must be said, that we are compelled to consider him in some degree untrustworthy, on some other points besides this. The general sentiment of the Church is shown by the strength of feeling exhibited against him in this matter: *In cuius rei tractatione*, says the learned Huet, *tantum sibi permisit Origenes, ut non aliam ob causam majores in se querelas concitavit.*² He founded his doctrine on a wild dream of the pre-existence of souls, and their merits in a previous state; a doctrine which, however favoured by Plato (and possibly by our own Wordsworth and some few others), has never found a home in the Christian Church. The wondrous powers of Origen, no doubt, imbued some others with a slight tinge of the same sentiment. Moments there are, probably, in the lives of most men, when they would gladly disbelieve this doctrine, if they dared. The eminent teachers above-named have (seldom more than once and away) yielded to such sentiments; but they are not herein consistent with each other or with themselves. Not with each other, for the pre-existence of souls, asserted by Origen, is distinctly denied by S. Gregory of Nyssa;³ the restitution of the evil angels, as well of wicked men, is asserted by some and denied by others; and, lastly, as has been already mentioned, they all (including Origen himself), in some passage of their writings, assert that Eternity of Misery which they elsewhere contravene. In their assertions of a finality of woe, they seem to build, either on private theories or obscure texts, or else to be trusting to the great but erratic genius of a single Father; in their avowals of its endlessness, they build up no theory, but simply accept the plain and obvious

¹ 'Lyra Apostolica,' republished also in 'The Cathedral.'

² 'Origeniana,' p. 216 in tom. iv. of the Benedictine edition.

³ This was pointed out to us by a most learned person, who is engaged upon an edition of the works of this Father. On Origen's errors, the famous letter of S. Jerome to Avitus deserves study; though there runs through it a tendency in *pejus interpretari*.

meaning of our Lord's words, the teaching of Christ Himself and of His Church. And after the condemnation of this error of Origen, which is generally assigned to the Fifth General Council (held at Constantinople in A.D. 553) the unanimity of teaching remained unbroken, save here and there by some pantheising mystic, until the outburst of those Anabaptists, whose lawless excesses made them the terror of Christendom and, for a brief season, the scandal of the Reformation.

We have intimated that the Fathers do not philosophize upon this theme. We do not mean, of course, that very solemn and suggestive reflections upon it may not be culled from their works. There is much that is striking in the early apologists, as Lactantius, Minucius Felix, S. Justin Martyr.¹ S. Augustine, in the Twenty-first Book of the 'De Civitate Dei,' and against the Priscillianists, is clear and emphatic; so is S. Gregory the Great, in his 'Morals in the Book of Job.'² S. Chrysostom, and even Origen, make acute and thoughtful comments on the *form* of expression in S. Matthew xxv.—comments handed on to us by Maldonatus and Dean Alford. S. Athanasius³ is, as usual, brief and weighty; Tertullian,⁴ *more suo*, only too fierce and emphatic. In the Middle Ages, S. Anselm and S. Bernard (especially the latter) show a manifest delight in relieving the due and necessary announcement of wrath on the obdurate and impenitent, by the glad tidings of mercy for the repentant. And, if Venerable Bede and Ayguan display a somewhat material tendency, this must be ascribed, perhaps, rather to their age than to themselves. The same may be said of that Vision of Albericus, which may have helped to kindle the fancy of him who produced the first great and enduring work of modern literature. And though, in this life, the truth of Dante's famous lines over the portal of Hell must ever remain a matter of faith rather than of the full and complete acquiescence of the reason, yet is it good to think them over well; to see if, even now, we may not be able to discern some faint glimmer of the grounds of a decision so terrible:—

¹ Lactantius in lib. vii. 21 of his 'Institutiones.' For Minucius see § 35; S. Justin Martyr in many places, e.g. Apol. i. § 12.

² Tom. vii. pp. 618, 629 *seq.*; tom. viii. p. 613 *seq.* (ed. Ben.)

³ Lib. xxxiv., much used and appealed to by Ayguan on Psalm ix. 17.

⁴ Cont. Apollinarium, lib. i. § 14; lib. ii. § 17.

⁵ In the truly painful passage which concludes the *De Spectaculis*—a passage not to be read without deep regret, and which may have some real connexion with the author's fall into Montanism. Gibbon eagerly lays hold of it; the Editor of the Oxford Translation (Dr. Pusey) condemns, though of course with respect and modesty. Perhaps we can hardly imagine how we should have felt towards the heathen had we lived in the midst of such fiery persecution, and had grace to stand firm, and courage to defy the persecutors.

'Per me si va nella città dolente :
 Per me si va nell' eterno dolore :
 Per me si va tra la perduta gente.
 Giustizia mosse 'l mio alto Fattore :¹
 Fecemi la divina Potestate
 La somma Sapienza, e 'l primo Amore.²
 Dinanzi a me non fur cose create,
 Se non eterne, ed io eterna duro :
 Lasciate ogni speranza, voi che 'ntrate.'³

We have said that we recognise the striking character of many of the patristic comments upon the texts above cited. Such is, for example, the comment of S. Chrysostom and others above alluded to, which points out how our Lord calls the redeemed the 'blessed of His Father, but does *not* call the lost the 'cursed of His Father,' for that the Father curses none, but they draw the curse upon themselves—how He speaks, too, of the kingdom eternally prepared for them on the right hand, but declares the everlasting fire to have been prepared—*not* for those on the left hand, but for the devil and his angels. Searching, too, is the comment of S. Gregory, asking how we can trust the *promises* of One, of whom we do not believe the *threats*; and able, as usual, are the arguments of S. Augustin against the Priscillianists. But upon the whole it may, we think, be fairly questioned, whether there exists any philosophic and elaborate defence of this dogma before the commencement of the eighteenth century. Even Aquinas seems to us, on this theme, to be below his usually high standard of acuteness; and the Reformers were content to assert and simply condemn impugnors without arguing. In truth, the only opponents of their day, the Anabaptists, were not persons to be met with arguments. The civil sword was, in their case, a matter of absolute necessity.

The causes of this deficiency in theological literature are not far to seek. It is probably a necessary condition of a philosophic statement of any single doctrine, that that doctrine should have been *specially* and *persistently* attacked; and such attack is, in this case, of comparatively modern date.

¹ Cf. 2 Thess. i. 6—9, and kindred passages.

² The Three Persons of the Most Holy Trinity.

³ 'Through me you pass into the city of woe :
 Through me you pass into eternal pain :
 Through me among the people lost for aye.
 Justice the founder of my fabric moved :
 To rear me was the task of power divine,
 Supreme wisdom and primeval love,
 Before me things create were none, save things
 Eternal, and eternal I endure.
 All hope abandon, ye who enter here.'

—CARY (*Inferno*, Canto III)

The early apologetic writers against Paganism—Lactantius, Minucius Felix, S. Justin Martyr, S. Clement of Alexandria, and others—are all, as we shall see, able to appeal to pagan witnesses on behalf of their teaching respecting a future state. And, indeed, it seems open to great doubt, whether the most intellectual unbelievers, in any age, have been able to free themselves from the fear engendered by the possibility of the truth of hell. Celsus does *not* make it one of the groundworks of his objections to Christianity, nor do we remember to have met with it in the remains of the scoffing Julian. Porphyry's line of attack runs, if we mistake not, in a different direction. Of Lucretius we shall speak presently. In modern times, Rousseau did not venture to answer the question further than by a confession of utter ignorance—*je n'en sais rien*. Diderot, representing his doubts in the form of a dialogue with his own soul, writes: 'If you misuse your reason, you will be not only miserable in this life, but you will be so still after death in hell.' 'And who has told you that there is a hell?' 'Under the very circumstance of the doubt, you ought to conduct yourself as if there were one. 'And how if I am sure that there is not?' '*I defy you to be sure.*' A correspondent of Voltaire writes to him that he believes that he has at last found out to a certainty the non-existence of hell. Voltaire's reply is: 'You are very fortunate! I am far from that point' (*Vous êtes bien heureux! Je suis loin de là.*)¹

This, however, by the way. What we wish to observe is, that the rise of Socinianism necessitated, in some degree, a closer looking into the matter. Sermons treating specially of the matter begin to appear;² and the eighteenth century witnesses the publication of the deep remarks made by Bishop Butler, in his 'Analogy,' and the elaborate scriptural investigation of Dr. Horbery.

3. The nineteenth century has seen a new phase of the controversy. Before the present age a critic could almost always name some avowed and definite heresy, which was taught concomitantly with the denial of eternal punishment by those who impugned this dogma. It is not now perhaps, always possible to do this. But the result has been, as we said at the commencement of this paper, that a greater number of profound and philosophic essays on the subject have been published during the last thirty years than at any previous epoch, and that men so differently trained as the American Presbyterian Dr. Cheever, the Baptist Mr. Spurgeon, Anglican divines such

¹ All three cited by M. Nicolas.

² E.g., we find a very good one among the Sermons of J. Killingbeck, Vicar of Leeds in 1700.

as Bishop Ellicott and Canon Wordsworth, the Lutherans Erbkam and Julius Müller, Roman Catholics from France, Italy, and Spain (Nicolas, Passaglia, Balmes) are all to be found uttering solemn and emphatic warnings against the perils of Universalism.

Who and what manner of men are ranged upon the opposite side, in ages past or in the present time, we ought, according to our arrangement, to consider here. But, on second thoughts, we postpone that question for a few pages, and we dismiss for the moment any further reference to the interpreters of Holy Scripture with this reflection—that the prayer '*sit anima mea cum sanctis*' is a natural and a righteous aspiration; and what, let each ask himself—what is in this matter the teaching of God's most devoted servants of all time? With whom are we taking part and lot if we reject this doctrine? Whose words are we accepting?—*whose are we rejecting?* With the holy Gospels in our hands, with prayer for guidance into all truth upon our lips and in our hearts, shall we not fear lest unbelief in hell may be more than lack of sympathy with the saints—may be a want of faith and loyalty to their King?

III. And now, for a time, we bid farewell to Holy Scripture, and suppose it, for argument's sake, to be to us as a sealed book. The question before us shall be, not whether we could accept as binding on the conscience such a dogma as that of eternal punishment apart from revelation (for to that question we venture to assume an answer in the negative), but whether, with the universe, and mankind, and its history and literature before us, there is not such an *à priori* presumption on the side of the truth of this doctrine, as should incline us the more acquiescingly and reverently to accept it when it comes before us with the stamp of a Divine authority.

Firstly, however, let us gladly, thankfully, unreservedly, proclaim the evidence borne by all these witnesses to the existence of gladness, mercy, harmony, and love. That marvellous framework of nature, which the Greek emphatically called Order (*κόσμος*); the earth and sky, with all their varied and inexhaustible appeals to our sense of beauty; human nature, with all its rich and strange endowments, its wisdom, its courage, and its love; the sense of protection over us through life; the very hopefulness which at times breathes throughout even the records of paganism itself—all these speak trumpet-tongued of the goodness of the Creator; all are a foretaste and, in some sense, a pledge of the existence of Heaven. In substance, even Christianity can add but little to the force of the

argument for the Divine existence and providence employed by Socrates against Aristodemus.¹

Willingly, indeed, would we linger over this aspect of the case; but for such lingering we have not, at present, either the requisite leisure or the space. The necessities of our subject compel us to turn our thoughts in another direction, and to ask whether, as honest thinkers, who desire above all things to look facts in the face, we can for a moment maintain that nature and history point to no other conclusions than those peaceful and blessed ones just enumerated.

With regard to the teaching of natural scenery, we may fitly quote the language of one who, if at times an impetuous advocate, has on such a theme most fairly won the right to a respectful attention. Mr. Ruskin writes as follows:—

‘Two great and principal passions are evidently appointed by the Deity to rule the life of man: namely, the love of God, and the fear of sin and of its companion—Death. How many motives we have for love; how much there is in the universe to kindle our admiration and to claim our gratitude, there are, happily, multitudes among us who both feel and teach. But it has not, I think, been sufficiently considered how evident, throughout the system of creation, is the purpose of God that we should often be affected by fear: not the sudden, selfish, and contemptible fear of immediate danger, but the fear which arises out of the contemplation of great powers in destructive operation, and generally from the perception of the presence of death. Nothing appears to me more remarkable than the array of scenic magnificence by which the imagination is appalled, in myriads of instances, when the actual danger is comparatively small; so that the utmost possible impression of awe shall be produced upon the minds of all, though direct suffering is inflicted upon few.’

Then, after describing, with his wonted richness of language, a thunderstorm, and contrasting its moral effect on the minds of many, as contrasted with the actual bodily injury done to comparatively few, he proceeds to say:—

‘And this is equally the case with respect to all the other destructive phenomena of the universe. From the mightiest of them to the gentlest—from the earthquake to the summer-shower, it will be found that they are attended with certain aspects of threatening, which strike terror into the hearts of multitudes more numerous a thousandfold than those who actually suffer from the ministries of judgment; and that, besides the fearfulness of these immediately dangerous phenomena, there is an occult and subtle horror belonging to many aspects of the creation around us, calculated often to fill us with serious thought, even in our times of quietness and peace. *I understand not the most dangerous, because most attractive form of modern infidelity, which, pretending to exalt the beneficence of the Deity, degrades it into a reckless infinitude of mercy and blind obliteration of the work of sin, and which does this chiefly by dwelling on the manifold appearances of God's kindness on the face of creation. Such kindness is indeed every-*

¹ Lord Macaulay has remarked this. Cf. the testimonies brought together in Dr. Rorison's extremely clever book, ‘The Three Barriers’ (Edin. and London: Blackwood, 1861), Appendix B.

where and always visible, but not alone. Wrath and threatening are invariably mingled with the love; and in the utmost solitudes of nature, the existence of Hell seems to me as legibly declared, by a thousand spiritual utterances, as that of Heaven. It is well for us to dwell with thanksgiving on the unfolding of the flower, and the falling of the dew, and the sleep of the green fields in the sunshine; but the blasted trunk, the barren rock, the moaning of the bleak winds, the roar of the black, perilous, merciless whirlpools of the mountain-streams, the solemn solitudes of moors and seas, the continual fading of all beauty into darkness, and of all strength into dust—have these no language for us? We may seek to escape their teaching by reasonings touching the good which is wrought out of all evil; but it is vain sophistry! The good succeeds to the evil as day succeeds to night, but so also the evil to the good. Gerizim and Ebal, birth and death, light and darkness, heaven and hell, divide the existence of man and his Futurity. . . . The love of God is, however, always shown by the predominance or greater sum of good in the end, but never by the annihilation of evil. The modern doubts of Eternal Punishment are not so much the consequence of benevolence as of feeble powers of reasoning. Every one admits that God brings finite good out of finite evil. Why not, therefore, infinite good out of infinite evil? ¹

History and literature surely confirm the truth of this impression. Far be it from us to palliate the sinfulness of Manichæan teaching. But it is only bare justice to say, that it never could have laid hold of the minds of any (least of all such a mind as that of S. Augustin) for a single moment, unless it had been able to frame a kind of *primâ facie* case from the nature of things. Similar remarks might be extended to the dark cruelties and superstitions of Paganism all over the world. Condemn them as we will, and however justly, they are yet facts of evidence which no honest inquirer will lightly put aside. They bear witness to men's sense of a dark and gloomy as well as of a bright side of life. They witness to men's fears of hell. And the same must be said of certain famous achievements in the sphere of literature, whether the writers have been religious or atheistical. In this respect the poetry of Æschylus or of Dante is not a more convincing evidence than that of Lucretius, Shelley, or Leopardi.

To come to the evidence of the Greek and Roman classics, This evidence has not yet been so fully examined as is desirable; and we are in danger of framing our inductions too hastily. Nevertheless, with every wish to accept thankfully the correction of any mistakes into which we may fall, we believe that the following positions will be found to be substantially correct:—

1. That no Greek or Roman writer ever denied the doctrine of an eternity of woe being in store for the utterly reprobate before the time of Epicurus, whose system of philosophy must

¹ 'The Stones of Venice,' vol. iii. pp. 157—139, and note. We are responsible for the italics.

be regarded as tantamount to a practical Atheism. (Very learned writers—as, for instance, Möhler—have declared that the treatment of slaves in ancient Rome became decidedly and seriously worse after the Epicurean doctrines had once obtained a footing there. We can well believe it: the Second Satire of Juvenal seems to imply thus much, and a good deal more besides.)

2. That, with one solitary exception, the classic authors who deny future punishment deny likewise any future bliss. In a word, they disbelieve in immortality altogether.

3. That the impugners of the dogma we are now considering seem to admit that what they are attacking is the old belief of their countrymen, and is still held, although a certain set have got beyond such things.

4. That the list of those who teach, or imply, the truth of the doctrine, includes the very noblest and most religious minds of antiquity; such as Homer, Pindar, Æschylus, Plato, Virgil—to say nothing of Diphilus, Ovid, and perhaps Persius.¹

We have not time to work out in detail the proof of these positions; but we trust to give sufficient evidence to enable the studious reader to investigate the subject more completely.

The most distinguished classic assailants of this dogma whose works have come down to us, are Lucretius, possibly Polybius, Sallust, Pliny, Catullus, Plutarch, and, we regret to add, Cicero. Let us say a word or two concerning each.

Of the sense of mystery and infinity, of the philanthropic temper displayed by the unhappy Lucretius, we have spoken in the very latest number of this *Review*. Let us now add, that it is one amongst the many valuable features of the *De Rerum Naturæ*, that it gives me an insight into the strength and prevalence of the beliefs that the poet is combating. We may form, for instance, some idea of the great effect produced by the Socratic argument from final causes, by observing what Dr. Rorison most justly calls the 'insane vehemence' of the poet's warning, that we must not on any account suppose that the eyes were created for the purpose of seeing, the limbs for walking and grasping, the ears for hearing, and so forth.

'Illud in his rebus vitium vehementer, et istum
Effugere errorem, vitareque præmeditator,
Lumina ne facias oculorum clara creata,
Prospicere ut possimus, &c.'²

¹ M. Nicolas has, however, made admirable use of Lucretius, Virgil, Ovid, Plato, and Persius. Some help may be obtained from commentators, as e.g. Stocker on Juvenal, Sat. II., and from a valuable note in Morris's 'Essay towards the Conversion of Hindus,' p. 304. Howe, in his 'Redeemer's Dominion over the Invisible World,' has some just remarks upon the heathen notions of Hades.

² Lib. iv. 823 et seq. We have followed the text of the Tauchnitz Edition.

Now, what does this atheistic writer tell us about future woe? He argues that the particular kinds of suffering said to be imposed upon Tantalus, Sisyphus, and others cannot, from their very nature, be eternal. 'They typify,' he says, 'the anguish of the human heart in this life. The mind, conscious of what it has done, fears by anticipation, goads and scourges itself, sees no prospect of a termination to its woes, of a cessation from punishment; and dreads, moreover, lest in death they should become more grievous. Yes! it fears all this, even though the actual bodily inflictions of the torturer be absent; and though Cerberus and the Furies and Tartarus have no existence, this terror is an extraordinary punishment for extraordinary crimes.' 'And that fear of hell,' he says, 'must be utterly expelled—the fear which thoroughly disturbs human life from its lowest depths, bedarkening everything with the blackness of death, and not suffering any pleasure to remain clear and unalloyed.' And, lest there should be any doubt respecting the enduring nature of what is feared, he has observed in an earlier book: 'If men could see that there was a definite end to their troubles, they would in some wise have power to resist the teachings of creeds (*religionibus*) and the threats of bards. Now there is no method, no opportunity, for obtaining repose, *since we must fear eternal pains in death.*'¹

It is certainly much clearer, if not sounder, than Mr. Walker's in the 'Corpus Poetarum.'

¹ Lest our weak half-paraphrase, half-translation, should do injustice to the forceful diction of this great genius, we subjoin the three passages referred to:—

'Cerberus et Furis jam vero, et lucis egenus
Tartarus, horriferos eructans faucibus æstus,
Hæc neque sunt usquam, neque possunt esse profecto.
Sed metus in vita pœnarum pro malefactis
Est insignibus insignis, scelerisque luela
Carcer, et horribilis de saxo iactu 'deorsum,
Verbera, carnifices, robur, pix, lamina, tædæ:
Quæ tamen et si absunt, at mens sibi conacia facti
Præmetuens, adhibet stimulos, torretque flagellis;
Nec videt interea, qui terminus esse malorum
Possit, nec quæ sit pœnarum denique finis;
Atque eadem metuit, magis hæc ne in morte gravescant.'
LIB. III. 1024—1035.

'Et metus ille foras præceps Acherontis agendus
Funditus, humanam qui vitam turbat ab imo;
Omnia suffundens mortis nigrore: neque ullam
Esse voluptatem liquidam puramque relinquit.'
LIB. III. 37—40.

'si certam finem esse viderent
Ærumnarum homines, aliqua ratione valerent
Religionibus atque minis obsistere vatum.
Nunc ratio nulla est restandi, nulla facultas;
Æternas quoniam pœnas in morte timendum.'
LIB. I. 109—112.

Sad as is the spectacle of such splendid powers so misused, it is impossible, we think, to meditate upon the words of Lucretius without a feeling of very deep sympathy and compassion, not uncrossed by a bright ray of hope. For if indeed, as he assures us, this fear *did* so penetrate into the very inmost being of his contemporaries as to shake their very souls and bedim the lustre of all their earthly joys, then, surely, not wholly in vain can have been that terror—not entirely without effect upon their hearts and lives. Gloomy indeed as must needs have been the prospect apart from the knowledge of the remedy, we hope and believe that the infinite virtue of the Sacrifice once offered upon Mount Calvary has overflowed even upon those who knew not of its pre-ordained consummation, nor were taught to look forward to it in hope: and we stand in thought in the presence of those spirits in the same frame of mind as a youthful poet, early taken from amongst us, stood in the tombs of their Etruscan brethren:—

‘Have they perished then for ever?—O Thou Beam of Light Divine,
That hast streamed on every nation from Thy Fount in Palestine!
Thou hast raised a victory-trophy, e’en in Hades and the grave,
Who may tell what dawn Thou’lt flush around the prisoners of this cave!’

Polybius need not detain us. Hard, matter-of-fact, and disbelieving in the supernatural, he holds that Scipio and Lycurgus² only appealed to the religious sentiment for the sake of putting their countrymen in better spirits. Indeed, we do not remember any special attack upon future chastisement in the remains of this author; but we assume that he probably did disbelieve in it, as a necessary part of his general infidelity.

Sallust represents Julius Cæsar as proclaiming in the Senate-house, that ‘in grief and misery death is a rest from troubles, not torture (*cruciatum*); that it puts an end to all the woes of mortals; that beyond it there is no place for anxiety, nor for joy.’³ He describes Cato as replying to this speech; and we are inclined to think the Delphin editor is right in supposing that Cato’s allusion to the above-cited words is meant ironically, and conceals reproof: ‘Well and skilfully (*benè et composîtè*) has Caius Cæsar just now discoursed before this assembly concerning life and death, holding, I presume, as false those traditions respecting the shades below, to the effect that the wicked traverse a different road from the good, and inhabit regions rough, uncultured, foul, and full of dread.’⁴ Now, Lord Brougham and some other critics regard both these speeches as the compositions of the historian. To us it seems that they may be so in *form*, and yet be really based upon some

¹ Poems by the late Hon. H. R. Skeffington.

² ‘Bell Catilin,’ p. 42 (Ed. Delph).

³ Lib. x. cap. ii. § 8—12.

⁴ Ibid., p. 46.

report of what *was* said in the Senate. But, in reference to our present theme, it matters little which view be adopted. If Julius Cæsar did speak thus, it is all of a piece with his character. The greatest and most versatile of all Romans, but among the most selfish and (even according to a heathen standard) the most immoral, it is not strange that, in the declining age of Roman virtue, *he* should hold such language, and describe death as an eternal sleep. But if Sallust has simply put the words into his mouth, we then have a historian, given indeed to the expression of a sententious morality, but of very indifferent personal character, intuitively fixing, with dramatic propriety, upon the proper character for the utterance of sentiments so miserable, so opposed to the belief of those who had made Rome what she was—who had prepared her to become the mistress of the world.

Pliny, in like manner, simply denies *all* existence after death. Neither body nor soul have any subsequent powers of sensation. Human vanity feigns to itself a future life. Some teach an immortality of the soul, some a change of form (*transfigurationem*); some assign feeling to the *Inferi*, and worship or deify the Manes: as if [the mere naturalist peeps out here]—as if the human mode of existence differed from that of other animals; as if there were not many longer-lived beings, for which no one prophesies immortality. No! these stories belong to the class of mere childish blandishments; they are the fabrications of a mortality that longs for endless existence (*Puerilium ista delinimentorum, avidæque nunquam desinere mortalitatis commenta sunt*). Such fondness and credulity destroys Nature's principal boon—namely, death; and it doubles the regret of dissolution if pain forms part of the idea of a future state of existence.¹ Pliny is at least consistent, and does not seem to have that difficulty in shaking off the notion of a futurity which surely, amidst all his denials, seems to haunt the imagination of Lucretius. But by Pliny's time such faith as Roman Paganism once had had waxed faint and cold, and those who longed for immortality were, happily, looking elsewhere for the satisfaction of the instinctive yearnings of their hearts.

It is hardly needful to add the parallel and well-known passage of Catullus:—

Soles occidere et redire possunt:
Nobis, cum semel occidit brevis lux,
Nox est perpetua una dormienda.²

Plutarch, in his treatise on Superstition, describes its victim as

¹ C. Plinii Secundi Natur. Hist., lib. vii. cap. 56.

² Ad Lesblam. Carmen V. We might conjoin with this the often-cited epitaph of Bion upon Mosehus.

fearing the deep gates of hell, its headlong streams of fire and gloom, its darkness and phantoms, its ghosts with horrid visages and wretched voices, its judges and executioners, and its chasms and dens full of innumerable miseries. And who is it that is advantageously contrasted with this man? It is the utter unbeliever in another world, simply and emphatically *the Atheist*.¹

We have forgotten to enumerate Lucian in our catalogue of assailants. Perhaps he is hardly worth counting. A professed scoffer at all religion (much more abundantly, however, at Paganism than Christianity), he will hardly be appealed to as a witness, excepting in so far as his 'Dialogues' bear witness to the ancient but then expiring faith of Pagans; and, so far, they seem to make rather for than against our case.²

In all these cases, then, we see a denial, not of the possibility of future misery, so much as of future existence of any sort whatever. All, too, give hints of a very opposite teaching being in vogue, or having been in vogue, in some quarters. Even Catullus speaks of *Rumores—senum severiorum*, which were possibly based upon a doctrine contrary to his easy Epicureanism. We now come to the one exception—Marcus Tullius Cicero.

We are not among those who would wish to deal harshly with his memory. We can conceive it possible that Mr. Long has learnt to judge him too severely from his 'Letters,' and that Lord Macaulay is rather hard in describing him as one 'whose whole soul was under the dominion of a girlish vanity and a craven fear.'³ But as a philosopher (and this is our present point of view), he must be considered as one of decidedly limited range. This is no new view, adopted by us to serve a purpose. In an article published in this *Review* in October, 1858, on a very different subject, Cicero was described 'as remarkably deficient in those profounder intuitions which in a Plato, a Proclus, a Cleanthes have preserved so many "wrecks of Paradise."' (We are glad to find that Dr. Döllinger, in his *Heidenthum und Judenthum*, entirely corroborates this judgment.)

Now, how far any of the pagan writers above quoted may have really given us the thoughts of their better mind (for all of us have a worse and a better mind) we cannot tell. Very solemn is that passage in the First Book of Plato's 'Republic,'⁴ wherein he speaks of the way in which fear and anxiety beset the mind of a man on the near approach of death; how the so-

¹ Cit. ap. Newman on 'Development,' chap. iv. § 1.

² See Mr. Dyer's article in Smith's 'Greek and Roman Biography,' and Mr. Farrar's 'Bampton Lectures for 1862.'

³ Essay on Lord Bacon.

⁴ Cap. v. p. 330 D.

called fables about matters in Hades, and the necessity of there paying the penalty for injustice wrought in this life, *up to that period derided*, then wrest his very soul (*στρέφουσιν αὐτοῦ τὴν ψύχην*) lest they should be true; and either from the weakness of old age, or *as being ever nearer to those places*, he has the more clear perception concerning them. But the good man, as beautifully described by Pindar, enjoys the consolation of a sweet hope. Are we sure that some of these unbelieving authors may not at other seasons have experienced such a sense of terror, despite the easy, careless tone of their writing?

We could easily conceive this of Cicero, so much influenced as he is by the thought of those to whom he is writing. But we must admit that he is the one exception (and we always expect to find *one*) to our general principle. Both in a speech and in his *De Natura Deorum*, he is contemptuous in his disbelief of the dogma which we are discussing. Happily, we have a fit commentator at hand. One of the purest minds and finest intellects of our age, the lamented Arthur Hallam, has touched upon it in a most thoughtful manner. After speaking of Cicero's 'contemptuous disbelief of the doctrine,' he asserts his own conviction that there seems 'to be no natural connection, but the contrary, between this doctrine and our inherent hope of immortality,' and that 'seldom do we find an instance of such a belief gaining ground, independently of positive religion or of analogous traditions.' We are not prepared to express an opinion offhand upon the deep and difficult question thus raised. But most thoroughly do we adopt what follows:— 'Accustomed to transfer our notions of earthly legislation to the idea of the Divine character, our thoughts readily ascribe remedial punishment to the moral regulation of the universe, but are by no means equally inclined to admit the infliction of absolute ruin as compatible with Supreme Benevolence. *But it is not so easy as we imagine to adjust the deep of creation by measurements of fancy, impelled by passion.* "Omnia exeunt in mysterium" was the maxim of the schoolmen. That tremendous mystery, which involves the nature of evil, may include the irreversible doom of the sinful creature within some dreadful cycle of its ulterior operations. *This view is indeed gloomy, and such as the imagination of man, for whom there are ills enough at hand without a gratuitous conjecture of more, will not naturally contemplate.* Yet for this very reason, perhaps, it is a presumption in favour of any scheme pretending to revelation, that it contains this awful doctrine.'

Such were the thoughts of that youthful mind over whose

¹ Essay on the Philosophical Writings of Cicero 'Remains,' pp. 203, 204).

early death the Poet Laureate has poured the lament of *In Memoriam*. We now turn to some heathen witnesses upon the other side.

The Hades of Homer is gloomy enough, even for the patriotic and virtuous. But can there be a doubt but that the great criminals—such as, for instance, Sisyphus—are spoken of in a way that gives no hint of hope for any change? What is the comment of Ovid? When Juno visits, for a purpose of her own, the realms below :—

‘Sisyphon aspiciens, Cur hic à fratribus, inquit,
Perpetuas patitur pœnas?’¹

Far more bright and beautiful is the celebrated picture drawn by Pindar :—

‘For ever bright by day, by night
Exulting in excess of light;
From labour free and long distress,
The good enjoy their happiness.
No more the stubborn soil they cleave,
Nor stem, for scanty food, the wave,
But with the venerable gods they dwell:
No tear bedims their thankful eye,
Nor mars their long tranquillity;
While those accursed howl in pangs unspeakable.

* * * * *
‘Who keep with righteous destination
The soul from all transgression pure;
To such, and such alone, is given
To walk the rainbow-paths of Heaven,
To that tall city of almighty time
Where Ocean’s balmy breezes play,
And flashing to the western day,
The gorgeous blossoms of such blessed clime
Now in the happy isles are seen,
Sparkling through the groves of green;
And now, all-glorious to behold,
Tinge the wave with floating gold.’

But the lot as of the righteous so also of the wicked is clearly represented as unchangeable. In a preceding stanza of this splendid Ode, we are told that the lawless souls of the departed there straightway pay the penalties of their deeds. And though the elegant translator,² whose version we have borrowed, has in this part of his work paraphrased the poet somewhat too freely, and added some depth of colouring from a more sacred source, yet we see no reason to apprehend that he has in anywise really misrepresented the mind of Pindar.

¹ Ovid. *Metamorph.* lib. iv. 465. Cf. on the Homeric Hades and Tartarus, Mr. Gladstone’s ‘Homer and the Homeric Age,’ vol. ii.

² Bishop Heber. Mr. Cary is far closer; but we have unfortunately mislaid our copy of his work.

'For whoso holds in righteousness the throne,
 He in his heart hath known
 How the foul spirits of the guilty dead,
 In chambers dark and dread
 Of nether earth abide, and penal flame,
 Where He whom none may name
 Lays bare the soul by stern necessity.¹

The writers who are most full of the recital of sufferings that cleanse—Æschylus, Plato, Virgil—all fix a limit somewhere. The guilt of Orestes is full of excuses; and we quite agree with the profound remark of Dean Trench, that the very sufferings which he endures are a kind of evidence that he is not in the worst condition of soul.² But though his sin is represented as purged by the expiations at Delphi and elsewhere, and the healing effects of time, there are crimes which cannot thus be washed away. 'The pollution of fratricide,' says the poet elsewhere, 'knows no old age.'³

Plato, in the eighty-first chapter of the *Gorgias*, speaks of those 'who have committed sins that are remediable' (οἱ ἂν ἰάσιμα ἁμαρτήματα ἁμάρτωσιν). 'But those,' he continues presently, 'who have committed the most extreme crimes, and have become 'by reason of these crimes incurable, of these are examples made, and they themselves are no longer in anywise benefited, as 'being incurable; but others are benefited who see these on 'account of their sins, undergoing for eternity the greatest and 'most painful, and most fearful sufferings' (διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας τὰ μέγιστα καὶ ὀδυνηρότατα καὶ φοβερώτατα πάθη πάσχοντας τὸν αἰὲν χρόνον). Plato proceeds to speak of the great and special dangers of men in authority, who form, he thinks, the majority of the Lost—their very position enticing them into the most unhallowed deeds. 'And Homer,' he adds, 'bears witness to this view; for he has in his poems represented those 'who are being punished eternally (τὸν αἰὲν χρόνον τιμωρουμένους) in Hades as kings and rulers—Tantalus, Sisyphus and 'Tityus.' Not that this is a necessary consequence of their position; statesmen may triumph over the difficulties of their

¹ Olymp. ii. 104 *sqq.* West paraphrases—

'The impartial Judge the rigid law declares
 No more to be reversed by penitence or pray'rs.'

And Heyne almost justifies this rendering by his comment—'λόγον φράσας sententiam ferens, non in gratiam, sed ita ut flecti nequeat, justitiā inexorabili, ἀνάγκῃ ἐχθρὰ infestd.' [The italics are Heyne's. The last phrase might admit of illustration from Butler's 'Analogy.']

² 'It is the noble Orestes whom the "dogs of hell" torture into madness; the obdurate Clytemnestra is troubled on account of her deed with no such spectres of the unseen world.'—TRENCH on the *Miracles*, p. 158 (First Edit.)

³ *Eumenides passim.* See especially 270–276, compared with Sept. cont. Theb. 679 (Ed. Paley).

position—witness Aristides ; but that it is to be feared the majority of them fail to do so.

Virgil follows in the wake of Plato: although at moments verging towards that Pantheism which (when pressed to its logical conclusions) annihilates the eternal and unalterable distinction between right and wrong, he is of far too religious a temper to allow him to be thus ensnared. With him, as with Homer, the Lower Realms contain those whose sad doom is irreversible. The vulture gnaws the liver of Tityus, which yet fails not, and his entrails prolific of penal woes.

*'Immortale jecur tondens fecundaque pœnis
Viscera.'*

And the Athenian monarch has no chance of escape—

'sedet, æternumque sedebit

Infelix Theseus.¹

Of Propertius we will say nothing, because he does not rightly seem to know his own mind. Nor will we press unduly the fine passage of Persius (Sat. III. 35), more than once praised by S. Austin. Juvenal is also perhaps a doubtful witness, though he at least implies a sense of the *practical* loss which the Roman nation was incurring through disbelief (II. 149). But we translate the following fragment, as less known, from the poet Diphilus:—

*'And think'st thou that the dead, Nikêrâtus,
Those who were lapped in luxury through life,
Escape, like ambush'd men, the Deity?
There is an eye of Justice, that sees all.
For e'en in Hades of two paths we deem,
One for the just, and one for godless men.
If earth shall cover both eternally,
Then go—snatch, steal, defraud, make anarchy.
Be not deceived, a judgment waits below,
Which God, the Lord of all things, shall ordain—
He whose dread name I would not e'en pronounce:
He to the sinner oft gives length of days.
But if such dream the crimes that he has wrought
Here in his day escape the eye Divine,
Ill is his fancy, and its victim he,
When Justice, now in idlesse, shall light down.
Look to it, ye who hold that God is none.
There is a God; and he of evil heart,
Who worketh ill, let him make gain of time;
For in time, too, he'll pay the penalty.'*²

¹ *Æn.* vi. 588, 617. Cf. the entire passage, 548—627.

² Cited by S. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* V. § 122. (The original Greek is re-quoted by Morris, *ubi supra.*) S. Clement has often been called more of a philosopher than a theologian; but no one, we believe, has ever disputed the genuineness of his quotations; and indeed, in this case, there is a neatness of diction and of versification which forbids the idea of forgery.

With two more very brief citations, we close this somewhat hasty survey of the teaching of the Western Classics. (We have already remarked that the ancient books, esteemed sacred by Orientalists, teach as Plato and Virgil do; and as for the one post-Christian book looked up to by Eastern religionists, the Koran and its commentators are only less distinct than the authority from which they have borrowed their teaching.)¹ Josephus, speaking of the strong feeling of the Essenes respecting the Life to come, describes their notions of Paradise, which seem borrowed from Pindar and Homer's 'Odyssey.' He then portrays the place for wicked souls as a recess, gloomy, stormy, replete with punishments that never relax (*γέμοντα τιμωριῶν ἀδιαλείπτων*).² In these matters, he adds, the Greeks have the same idea. We have said of Celsus that he did not raise objections to Christianity on this score. This assertion is less than the truth. Celsus does, indeed, ridicule the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, and thinks those who teach it unworthy of being argued with. But he fully concedes the Immortality of the Soul. 'Those,' he writes, 'who hope that it [the soul] will have an 'eternity with God, with such I will reason: in this, at least, they do think rightly, that those who have lived virtuously 'will be happy, but that the wicked will be utterly involved in 'eternal woes. And this dogma let not them nor any man ever 'resign.' (*Καὶ τοῦτου δὲ τοῦ δόγματος μήθ' οὔτοι, μήτ' ἄλλος ἀνθρώπων μηδεὶς ποτε ἀποστή.*)³

IV. The two great conditions of fairness in discussion are—*firstly*: that writers should state clearly their own convictions; *secondly*: that they enunciate with equal precision the views of those whom they oppose.

It is probably in this second portion of their task that the greatest amount of unfairness is committed. It does not, however, always follow that such injustice is intentional. It is quite possible that there may be real difficulty in making out what is really meant by opponents. We must own that such is, in part, our position at this point of our protracted (and, we fear, painful as well as fatiguing) discussion.

In part, only. Of the tenets of one set of opponents there is no doubt whatever: Universalism is, at least, clear and intelligible. It teaches that all men will ultimately be saved. How opposed to Scripture, and indeed to all religion, natural as well as revealed, this doctrine is in our judgment, has now been

¹ Morris refers to the Viah. Purana, p. 309, and also to Manu. Does not the Zendavesta speak similarly? For the Koran, see Suras 56, 78, and others.

² Orig. cont. Cels., lib. viii. § 49.

³ Joseph. Bell. Jud., lib. ii. cap. viii. § 11.

sufficiently explained. It is a matter of reasonable apprehension lest it should tempt many a soul, that might have been anxious, to become dead and careless, and perhaps to lose itself eternally. It is strange, but true, that what we have been able to learn, directly or indirectly, concerning Universalists, does not represent them as attaining to that cheerfulness which their creed would, if heartily accepted and thoroughly believed in, seem to warrant. But our experience is limited, and we fully admit that such a creed (utterly false and soul-perilling as we believe it to be) may have peculiar attractions, as for particular times and climes, even so too for persons of a certain bodily temperament. All circumstances—our century, our country, our social position, our physical constitution, our pecuniary means, and many more—are a part of that dispensation in which God has placed us, and each single one may be sanctified or may become a snare. ‘I went,’ says one of the most brilliant of living American authors—‘I went to a Universalist church, when I was in the city one day, to hear a famous man, whom all the world knows; and I never saw such pews-full of broad shoulders and florid faces, and substantial wholesome-looking persons, male and female, in all my life. Why, it was astonishing. Either their creed made them healthy, or they chose it because they were healthy.’¹

Most thoroughly do we believe in the literal truth of this description. The seeming alternatives suggested by the author need not necessarily contradict each other. In such cases there is mostly something of action and of reaction. The persons by whose external appearance the Professor was so much struck had, very probably, been greatly influenced in their choice by yielding to the special temptations incident to the possession of strong health and easy circumstances. And then, in turn, their creed may have certainly done its part in assisting to keep them so. But, alas for that Gospel whose invitations are specially addressed to such a class alone! It is not, it cannot be, the Gospel of Christ. In far other strains sound forth *its* warning voice: ‘Woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you that are full! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep. . . . And when He had opened the book, He found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; He hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of

¹ ‘Elsie Venner,’ by Oliver Wendell Holmes, p. 281 (London: Routledge, 1861).

'the Lord.'¹ Why in that Universalist congregation were there none that bore such an aspect? Is it not that in the hour of sorrow their creed is found to be that broken reed which only pierces the hand of him that leans upon it? Universalism may seem to suit some so long as it is fair weather; but failure of health, loss of fortune, the death of friends, ingratitude, disappointment, the pang of unrequited affection, the vanishing of earthly dreams of happiness and success—O Christ, Consoler of human hearts, to Thee may such come ere it be too late! And if their ease and comfort lie as a thick film across their spiritual vision, then, in whatever way Thou seest best, guide homeward to Thyself their wandering hearts and wills!

'My Lord and God, I pray,
Turn from their hearts away
This world's turmoil;
And lead them to Thy light,
Be it through sorrow's night,
Through pain or toil.'

Supported by the authority of God's Word, and of His Holy Church throughout the world, it is the duty of those who can influence religious, and all other, thought, each in his own sphere, and so far as his voice may reach, to denounce Universalism as a false and miserable delusion, opposed to the facts of nature and to the voice of the wise and good of all ages, injurious to the work of the Holy Spirit, and fraught with most alarming danger to the souls for whom Christ died.

But one thing we must in fairness grant to it; and that is, that it comes at least as an open foe, and undisguised. Face to face it stands against the dogma of everlasting loss to the obdurate and impenitent, and proclaims that they shall all alike, sooner or later, take their places among the redeemed. There is at least no mistaking this language. As S. Jerome puts the case in powerful language: 'The virgin and irrepenant harlot; she of a life of public scandal, and the Mother of the Lord; Satan, and the Archangel Gabriel; the Apostles, and the devils; the Prophets, and the false prophets; the Martyrs, and their persecutors—all are ultimately to enjoy a similar lot. How long distant may be the epoch matters not: redouble the years and seasons, and even let there be much suffering—it is all as one in the end. The question is not what we *have been*, but what we *shall be* for eternity.'² Either all this is true, or Universalism is false. If any single created being, the rebel arch-

¹ S. Luke vi. 24, 25; iv. 17—19. On the former of these passages (perhaps on the latter also), we know of few more powerful comments than the American poem of 'Two Millions.' The latter is admirably illustrated by Ary Scheffer's beautiful picture of *Christus Consolator*.

² S. Hieron: Comment. in cap. iii. Jonæ. (Cit. ap. Passaglia, p. 42). We have only given a rude paraphrase.

angel or the traitor apostle, be left out from the supposed restitution, then that restitution is not universal, and those who proclaimed it have taught falsely.

No wonder that some of the recent impugnors of the doctrine of an eternity of woe should shrink from such an extreme as the counter-doctrine which S. Jerome thus portrays. But then the question arises, if they do *not* teach Universalism, what *do* they teach? And to this query we find it wellnigh impossible to return a reply. There is the teaching of the Church, not pretending to say who or how many may be lost, nor the precise nature or place of their sufferings,¹ but believing that all punishment will be meted out by One who is infinitely just; that the *pœna sensûs* may be varied as God sees fit in each case,² and in some cases (as that of unbaptized infants) be wholly wanting; and that the *pœna damni*, felt more or less acutely by all who have rejected grace in proportion to the amount of guilt incurred, may probably be inappreciable to these infants who may not be suffered to know what they have lost. And if the whole be still a great mystery, this is only in accordance with the entire dispensation of things, a dispensation which must needs in this life be but very partially and imperfectly understood.

Now, we should certainly have imagined that this doctrine and the doctrine of Universalism formed a case of what logicians call 'excluded middle.' Either all will ultimately be saved, or all will not ultimately be saved. Universalists affirm the former position: the overwhelming majority of 'all who profess and call themselves Christians' (to say nothing of Jews, Mohammedans, Brahmins, and pious heathens) assert the latter. Is there any intermediate position that is intelligible or in anywise conceivable? We must avow that we cannot perceive it.

Of course, as in duty bound, we have tried our best to make out the tenets of those who oppose this dogma. First and foremost stands the distinguished—in many respects the most justly distinguished—name of Mr. Maurice. We all know that, in some way, he dissents from the Church's doctrine as ordinarily understood. But can any one inform us what is his positive teaching on this head? We have looked at Bishop Ellicott, who

¹ *Ignis æternus cujusmodi sit, et in quâ mundi vel rerum parte futurus sit, hominem scire arbitror neminem, nisi forte cui spiritus divinus ostendit.*—S. Aug. de Civ. Dei xx. 16. A well-known passage, and generally accepted. See Peter Lombard, Dist. iv. 44.

² This seems the natural, as it is certainly the usual, interpretation of S. Luke xii. 47, 48. See e.g. S. Basil as cit in loc in the *Catena Aurea*. As in what immediately follows the writer may seem to be weaving a theory in order to meet recent objections, it may be as well to say that he has simply followed the line of thought suggested by Aquinas.

warns and reproves Mr. Maurice; at a writer in the 'Tracts for Priests and People,' who warmly sympathizes with him; at the *National Review* for January, 1863, which thrusts him on one side. No one of these writers pretends to be clear about Mr. Maurice's meaning. Bishop Ellicott is obliged to add: 'If I rightly understand a sentence somewhat long and embarrassed, the meaning *seems* to be,'¹ &c. We shall wait till he has made his meaning clear.

Of other writers opposed to us (as the two above mentioned, and the author of 'Forgiveness after Death,') and of Bishop Colenso, we feel it a duty to speak plainly; for the subject is too serious to admit of vain compliments, or of personalities uttered for the mere sake of controversial rivalry. Unfortunately, we have not time left us for a detailed examination, but a few words must be said concerning each.

The remarks in Tract No. 5 for Priests and People, by the Rev. C. P. K., do seem to us (let what abatement is thought proper on the score of our prejudice be duly made) to be superlatively weak. We are told, for instance, that 'the whole subject is involved in the deepest mystery.' Who ever doubted this? But so is the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; so also that of the Incarnation and of our Redemption through Christ. The question is not, Is this mysterious? but, Is it true? If to say that a doctrine is mysterious is equivalent to an insinuation that it is untrue, it would be much simpler to say at once that revealed truth has no existence: for, from first to last, it is all involved in the deepest mystery.

But a great deal 'resolves itself into sensible imagery.' Undoubtedly: there is no other method of conveying truth to our minds. Modern philology has wellnigh demonstrated that in every language all mental ideas must needs be expressed by words originally applied to the things of sense. Sir W. Hamilton has pointed out that in Greek, Latin, German, English, Hebrew, and Sanscrit, the word for *soul* comes from roots signifying *breath, wind, air*.² He did not mean thereby to insinuate the non-existence of the soul. If we believe in Heaven, which S. John describes in the sublime book which closes the Canon by terms drawn from objects of earthly splendour; if the New Jerusalem does not 'resolve itself into earthly imagery' in such wise as to fade away, how dare we cease to believe in hell because its existence is announced in a similar manner?

¹ 'Destiny of the Creature,' p. 159. It is only fair to quote also some words, with which we fully sympathize:—'It is easy to understand how a writer, whose heart is so truly wide, and whose sympathies are so noble and generous, should have been led into unguarded statements upon this momentous subject. Such statements are, however, not the less to be deplored.'

² 'Lectures on Metaphysics,' vol. i. pp. 134, 135.

We had fully intended to go step by step through the arguments of the other writers alluded to. The tone of the Tract 'Forgiveness after Death' must be very highly commended. It is certainly most charitable and temperate; yet we cannot help wishing that both this writer and the author of the able article in the *National Review* had studied more deeply and extensively before committing their thoughts to print. We must frankly own to some surprise at the slenderness of the apparatus with which these clever and really earnest thinkers have undertaken to demolish the toils of ages.

We had also intended to consider at length the causes of the present state of feeling on these subjects: they are numerous and somewhat complex. At present we must content ourselves with remarking that we believe that many of the impugners of this solemn and awing dogma would be among the first to recoil from the results of their own teaching, if that teaching were once received on anything like an extensive scale. Was there no connexion between the denial of hell and its semi-realization upon earth, for a brief space, during the Reign of Terror in Paris under Robespierre? On this point it is well to reflect upon the following very thoughtful remarks of Balmes:—

'These reflections upon the nature of the development of the human mind in this century, and the ideas which have arisen touching the eternity of future punishment, are susceptible of being applied to many analogous subjects. Man has imagined that he could change and modify the Divine laws in the same way that he does those of human legislation; and thus, he has undertaken to introduce into the sentences of the Supreme Judge the same softness that he has given to those of earthly judges. The whole system of criminal legislation tends evidently towards the diminution of punishments—making them less afflictive, depriving them of all their horror, and economizing the suffering of mankind to the utmost. More or less, all of us who live in this age are affected by this softness; the penalty of death, stripes, all that conveys any notion of horror or suffering, is to us insupportable; and all the efforts of philosophy are required, and all the counsellings of prudence, to preserve in our criminal codes any vigorous punishments whatever. *Far be it from me to oppose this current; and would to God it were now needless for the good order and government of society to cause to be shed blood or tears! But it is requisite that this exaggerated sentimentalism should not be abused; that it should be observed that all is not philanthropy that hides itself beneath this veil, and that it should not be forgotten, that well-founded humanity is something more noble and elevated than that egotistic and weakly sentiment which will not permit us to see others suffer, because our feeble organization compels us to participate in their pains.* A person is horrified at the sight of a destitute fellow-creature, but he has a sufficiently hard heart to refuse him the smallest alms. What in such a case are his sensibility and humanity? The first, an effect of physical organization; the second, pure egotism.'

'This present century is so accustomed to excuse the crime, and interest itself in the criminal, that it entirely forgets the compassion which, on certainly more just grounds, is due to the victim; and would with all

good will leave the latter without any reparation at all, solely in order to spare the former those sufferings he so richly deserves. Let the dogma of Eternal Punishment be called, as loudly as possible, cruel and harsh; let it be said that so tremendous a doom is irreconcilable with Divine Mercy: we will reply, that far less could the absence of such a punishment be with the Divine Justice or with the good order of the universe: we will say that the world would be handed over to chance, that a large portion of its events would display the most revolting injustice, if there were not a terribly-avenging God who awaits the guilty beyond the grave, to demand from him an account of his perversity during his wanderings on this earth.'

What orthodox teacher has ever persisted in the denial of the Eternity of Punishment? Anabaptists have denied it—yes; but they were fain to overthrow society at large. Socinians deny it; but then, they also deny the Divinity of our Lord. Whiston denied it; but then, Whiston was an Arian, and (so far consistently enough) he denied at the same time the eternity of future happiness—a thought which, as the Poet Young justly says, would 'unparadise the realms of light' themselves. Sir J. Stephen assailed it; but Mr. Hopkins has shown the laxity and want of correct views on the Incarnation which underlie his generous sympathies. Mr. Maurice seems to impugn it; but is Mr. Maurice thoroughly trustworthy on the doctrine of The Atonement? Bishop Colenso disbelieves it; but then, who can say at what point in the path of disbelief Bishop Colenso may ultimately pause? Far be it from us to seek merely to point an argument by the introduction of an unpopular name; but is there, in all seriousness we would ask it—is there no warning in the circumstance that Dr. Colenso's downward career took its commencement from this starting-point?¹

And if any still think (as it has been said to us by one who had much claim to respectful sympathy—as it has been said too by others, both before and since)—'Surely God is as good as I am; and I would have everybody saved if I could:' it must be answered that the whole force of such considerations turns upon the meaning that is to be attached to the word *good*. We too often mean by it easy-going, kindly-tempered, but without any real hatred of sin as it exists about us, or, alas! within us—without any keen sense of what it is in the sight of God. 'Perhaps,' says Bishop Butler, 'Divine goodness—with which, if I mistake not, we make very free in our speculations—may not

¹ That Commentary (in which Bishop Colenso denies the eternity of punishment) was written long before—'at a time when I had no idea of ever holding my present views' ('Colenso on the Pentateuch,' Part I. p. 148). Most fully can we believe this assertion. No man knows where such denials *may* lead him. A very distinguished Presbyterian minister told us that he attributed a good deal of the tendency to Universalism, in a particular part of the country, to the influence of a layman who took deep interest in religious questions. He added that this layman was believed to have lately insinuated doubts as to the Personality of the Holy Spirit!

'be a bare single disposition to produce happiness, but a disposition to make the good, the faithful, the honest man happy.' Until we can more nearly see things as God sees them, we must be pronounced no sufficient judges of the case. His mercies and His judgments are alike unsearchable. May we learn aright to fear the one, and to obtain through Christ the other for evermore!

Some sixteen years ago, the writer was a bystander, while a conversation bearing upon the subject was carried on between some men well fitted to sustain such a discussion. The question at issue was not the truth of the Church's doctrine—for on that all were agreed—but the wisdom and propriety of having some preacher who should make it his special province to bring forward in due season, more prominently than was usually done, 'the terror of the Lord.' One, since mysteriously removed by illness from a sphere of much usefulness, said, 'Yes, perhaps it might be well if some one would make it his business to preach the severer side of truth; but he ought to be a very humble man.'

We cannot give to these words the effect produced upon the hearers by the quiet thoughtfulness of the speaker's tone of voice, still less the impression caused by the consciousness that his character gave him a peculiar right to utter such a strain of warning. But that warning, in itself, seems to us well worth repeating. Strange as it may seem, it is no less true than strange, that the office of proclaiming terrible verities to one's fellow-creatures does most signally expose the preacher to the temptation of spiritual pride. How this comes about it is not very needful to inquire. Whether there lurk within the teacher's breast some pharisaic thought that he is not as other men are, that his very denunciations secure him from being a castaway, or in whatever other way Satan may be enabled to lead such a man astray, the fact is evidenced by our experience in daily life, and by the evidence of Church History. It is the brave, the fervid, but, alas! the over-denunciatory Tertullian, who becomes a Montanist and severs himself from Christ's Church. It is the eager condemner of all heresy, Nestorius, who himself becomes heretical, and teaches a divided Christ. For our own sakes, as well as for the truth's sake, we have the deepest need to be watchful, and to remember that the proclamation of such terrors does entail upon those who announce them the culture of a special humility.

But even such considerations, all-important as they are, may be pressed beyond their due limits. In the first place, we must take care that we do not use them as instruments of self-deceit,

and persuade ourselves that we are withholding the sterner elements of truth from a sense of our own unworthiness; while, in reality, our silence proceeds from cowardice, from love of popularity, or from an evil heart of unbelief. If we think that we are not pure enough, not humble enough, to handle themes so full of awe, it must be remembered that we are, of ourselves, equally unfit to speak of the glories of heaven and the redeeming love of God. But whatever authority we have to teach the one, that same authority urges us, in its due place, to announce the other likewise. And if, in an age but too prone to an excessive sentimentalism, they who utter such unwelcome truths be stigmatized as hard of heart and pitiless, it may well be asked whether it is the Christian teacher's mission to please men, and whether the bestowal of such gratification be a necessary mark of the true servants of Christ?

And yet, indeed, there is a sense in which, perhaps, a higher praise than any upon earth may be in store for those who fearlessly attempt to declare, so far as in them lies, the whole counsel of God. Among the many millions of souls who have departed this life in the faith and fear of Christ, there must be numbers who owe their first serious thoughts, under God, to the agency of a wholesome terror of the Divine Judgments. Few, it has been said, and, we believe, with perfect truth—few have fallen into hell who ever thought much about hell. It is the obstinate aversion to that which contravenes our own weak views of sin—it is the determination to explain away the plainest and most emphatic words, that constitute men's real danger. And if by plain and simple enforcement of Christ's words we should be permitted to rouse any minds to a sense of their peril, and to lead them to seek for salvation through Christ; if thus we should save a soul from death, and, by God's mercy, meet that spirit in the world unseen, what triumph of this earth could bear the most distant comparison with such a victory over sin and Satan?—what gratitude for any kindness here below could be like the gratitude of that soul, towards one who had been a partial instrument in winning for it its eternal bliss?

Need we add, that while the circumstances of our time appear to call for contributions of this nature to our theological literature, we must earnestly endeavour, on this as on all other topics, to preserve 'the proportion of the faith'? Such an essay as the reader has now been studying must, in the very nature of things, be somewhat one-sided. Of necessity, it speaks much of God's justice, and but little of His mercy. Yet, far be it from us to forget that in His works and, much more, in His Word, mercy occupies by much the larger space, and ever 'rejoiceth against judgment.' Far be it from us to place fear as a motive on the

same level with holy hope, much less with holy love. Enough there is in the Gospel to bid the most abandoned sinner not to despair: 'Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.' And although it is not for us to draw a line which is known to the Divine Omniscience only; yet, it seems probable that those alone will be eternally lost who have practically said to their Maker—'I will have none of you.' Assuredly, any who suffer such loss and woe will have drawn it on themselves by their own deliberate act.

And if these pages should fall into the hands of any one who may be still in doubt, we would beg that such an one would accept from us the warning of a parting word, although (like most of what has gone before) it has already been partially spoken by other tongues. In the course of some fifty years—probably at a very much earlier date—both writer and reader must be in a position that will rend asunder for them the veil which at present hides the world unseen. Then will doubt be resolved into certainty, and mysteries, at present but faintly intelligible, become clear alike 'to him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not.' We have seen in how many cases a doubt—which, happily, dared not expand itself into denial—was all that even those who were most interested in disbelieving the existence of hell could attain unto. Well were it for such sceptics to act at least upon the safer side—to try so to order their lives as if what they so shrink from believing may prove true. May He, the Merciful, who has revealed this truth, make up for all reticence on the part of those who are in duty bound to repeat His warnings—for all faults in manner on the part of those who do assert it because He has said it! What better thing can such teachers wish for themselves and for those who listen to their voice, than that both may together be delivered from that terrible and hopeless doom? 'Spare Thy people, whom Thou hast redeemed by Thy precious Blood, and be not angry with us for ever. By the mystery of Thy holy Incarnation; by Thy Cross and Passion; by all that Thou hast wrought and suffered for us in Thy Life and Death, and by Thine Intercession at the right hand; from Thy wrath, and from everlasting damnation, *Good Lord, deliver us!*'

ART. IX.—*The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined.* By the Right Rev. JOHN WILLIAM COLENZO, D.D., Bishop of Natal. Part II. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green. 1863.

It is amusing to observe how pertinaciously the Bishop of Natal adheres to the Latitudinarian party in the Church, and how unscrupulously they throw him overboard. He avows his entire sympathy with them, but they will have nothing to do with him; he mixes himself up with 'Essays and Reviews,' but the Essayists and Reviewers maintain a profound silence; he makes several bids for Mr. Maurice's support, but Mr. Maurice can see a line of demarcation between himself and the author of the 'Critical Examination of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua,' which Dr. Colenso cannot recognise; and his declaration of open war with the authors of the papers in the volume entitled 'Aids to Faith' entirely fails to elicit any kind of approval from the sympathizers with the views which that volume attacks. He proclaims aloud his indignation at the heavy losses actually sustained by Mr. Heath by his loss of preferment and the means of living in the sacred cause of freedom of thought, and calculates the probable sum in which Messrs. Wilson and Williams will be mulcted if their appeal to the Privy Council is unsuccessful; but these gentlemen seem in no hurry to identify their cause with his. The principle of free-handling seems to stand aghast at its own precipitate development; and it appears that people who have gone along with the stream hitherto will rather incur the charge of inconsistency and want of logic, than at once proceed to make sacrifice of the faith in which they have been educated from their childhood. We really cannot find that any person has ventured to come forward and endorse the statements of either of the volumes which have been published by Dr. Colenso. We do not observe that, in the list of the current publications of the day, there are any pleas put out in his defence, any attempt to throw a veil over his assertions, or to institute a half-apology by showing that at least there is some truth involved in his allegations. He is assailed in the Magazines and Reviews with a perfect hail-storm of missiles, and no one appears to utter a syllable in his defence, except the writers in the Unitarian, the semi-infidel, and sceptical periodicals. These last, we suppose, contain the 'heartly welcome and encouragement' which the author says his book has met with from 'many influential quarters,' and for

which, in his preface to the Second Part, he offers his acknowledgments and thanks. As regards all others, it seems as if Churchmen and Dissenters were for once agreed ; and, as far as the world of professing Christians in this country is concerned, the Bishop of Natal stands absolutely alone.

There is, indeed, one periodical—the *Athenæum*—which has admitted some letters written by Dr. Kalisch and Professors Hupfeld and Ewald to the Bishop of Natal, which have been inserted by the Bishop himself. These are full of sympathetic expressions ; and we doubt not thousands of unbelievers might be found who would express their opinion in language more or less resembling the contents of these letters. Meanwhile, we shall content ourselves with observing, that there does not appear, even amongst the most ardent admirers of Dr. Colenso, any appearance of compliment as to his critical skill or philosophical acumen. The point which elicits applause is his boldness. Whether this quality, as exercised in the attempt to demolish the authority of Canonical Scripture, is entitled to a high degree of praise is what will be variously judged of according to the prepossessions of him who judges. The manifesto of the English and Irish Archbishops and Bishops, both as regards the names which it contains as well as the few who, for whatever reason, are not there, probably represents the state of feeling which is general amongst the clergy and the more educated portion of the laity. If the opinion of the clergy were taken on the subject, there would be a few who, from some crotchety objection or other, would not subscribe to such a document ; some few, probably, who would only partially endorse it ; many, of course, who would fall in with the stream, and just do as others do : and perhaps this section find their representatives in two or three of the Irish prelates, who shall be nameless : whilst we can scarcely doubt there would be rather a larger number in proportion than appears in the Bishops' Protest who would be too indifferent to the matter to take any active steps in connexion with it. But there is not enough dissent from this manifesto at all materially to interfere with the opinion that this book has been unanimously condemned by the English clergy.

We have implied that the organs of nearly all the religious bodies outside the pale of the Church, as well as those of different parties in the Church, are unanimous in their condemnation. We do not say this as if there were anything surprising in such a fact, or anything that affords especial matter for congratulation ; it is simply that unanimity which would appear against any form of infidelity when once recognised as such ; it shows only that people are alive to the transactions which are going on around them, and that, whether they can answer difficulties or not, they do not mean to be cajoled out of

their faith by specious arguments. Meanwhile, it may, perhaps, afford matter of surprise to some that one important body of religionists in this country remains silent: we allude, of course, to the members of the Roman Communion.

It may be thought that they are about equally concerned with ourselves when the Canonical Books which we in common hold are attacked, and their authenticity and genuineness denied. Yet, whatever scattered notices of the sceptical productions of the day appear in their organs, their reticence as to the general questions at issue is somewhat remarkable, and suggests an inquiry into its causes. We shall not, we trust, be thought uncharitable if we just allude to the undeniable fact of the great want of learning which characterises the mass of people who belong to the Roman Communion in this country. Their learned men may be counted by units, but their number will scarcely reach into two figures. After mentioning Cardinal Wiseman's name with the respect which is due to his various gifts of mind and his large acquirements, we are at a loss to find any of their number (we speak now, of course, of those who have been bred up amongst them, and not of converts from the Church of England) who will bear any sort of comparison with our own scholars and divines. They have, generally speaking, neither the means of providing for the education of their gentry, nor have they any of that liberal intelligence which, amongst ourselves, exhibits itself in innumerable *Quarterlies* and *Monthlies*. We say not a word in disparagement of the half-dozen intellectual converts whom they have gained, and whom we could ill afford to lose; but we think it cannot be denied that there is in their body, as at present existing both among clergy and laity, a very singular stagnation of intellect. The *Review* (*Home and Foreign Review*) which a liberal section of the English Romanists has lately started, as it has been all but condemned by authority, scarcely forms an exception to what we are saying. We shall be told, of course, that this is not singular, but merely the normal result which shows itself in the Roman Communion. It is not our business either to endeavour to substantiate or refute this accusation. We only notice the fact here as one of the causes which have been in operation to prevent replies to infidel objections coming from the pens of Roman Catholic writers. And it is right it should be mentioned, lest too great weight should be assigned to the other main cause to which the phenomenon is attributable.

We hope we shall not be misunderstood when we allege as the main reason of their silence the subordinate nature of the subject. Attacks upon the currently received interpretation of Scripture are judged to have more or less force in proportion as the person who judges of them gives his adherence to such

mode of interpretation. Now, it is obvious that there has been no more pronouncement of the Church Catholic upon the subjects of the Inspiration and Interpretation of Scripture, than there has been upon the Copernican theory of the Universe. It is quite possible that nearly all the pious minds of the seventeenth century may have felt strongly the impiety of a theory which appeared to them to contravene the express statements of Holy Writ. It was natural it should be so. Persons who were not acquainted with the Bible so far as to know that it spoke of the sun as moving round the earth, and people who disbelieved in the Divine origin of Holy Scripture, were in a more favourable position for judging of the scientific question than the learned and the religious. Neither ought the latter to be blamed for at first withholding their assent to assertions of which they could not understand the proof, and which appeared to them to militate against what had been revealed. Things took their own course; the truths of science have been established, and there is no one now who thinks there is any difficulty in the fact that Scripture speaks of the sun revolving round the earth, and that science tells us it is nearer the real state of the case to consider the earth as moving round the sun. It is most probable that if any book of Canonical Scripture had followed, in point of chronology, after some great physical discovery, which had been generally recognised, the expressions made use of by the writer would have accommodated themselves to the then existing state of knowledge. Thus the words of the inspired writers would have varied with the variations in the amount of scientific knowledge possessed by themselves and others of their time, as they manifestly adapted themselves to the state of development of the language at the time when they were written. Why should it be thought more repugnant to the truth that the writers of Canonical Scripture were inspired, that the sentiments they uttered did not anticipate the discoveries of modern science, than that they were clothed in a language which, at least in the New Testament, had greatly declined from its classical purity and beauty? Ever since the revival of Greek literature, scholars have been busily pointing out to us what, in some sense, may be called the defects of style in Evangelists and Apostles. This analogy between the two cases of science and language, as affecting theories of Inspiration, seems to us worth attending to; probably it may throw some light upon the question of verbal inspiration, as well as help towards the understanding of the subject generally.

But we have digressed a little from our immediate subject, which is the comparative unimportance to Catholics, whether

Roman or English, of attacks upon the received meaning of Scripture. We have said that the Church has not defined, for the most part, the interpretation of the historical books of the Old Testament. We are far from saying that the history is not literally true, still less that Scripture has not an ascertainable sense, but it is certain that the Church has never pronounced an interpretation on every particular of it. In fact, it is manifest that many parts—as, for instance, poetical or metaphorical expressions, and the like—would never be supposed by anybody to be taken literally. The alarm, therefore, that pervades the Protestant mind, which has nothing to fall back upon when its own interpretation of Scripture is impugned, scarcely reaches the Catholic, who has never laid so much stress on any particular method of exposition. Add to this the fact, that the one class of people are accustomed to disbelieve everything, unless they can see, or fancy they see it, proved from Scripture, and that the others take all doctrine upon the authority of the Church, and it is at once seen that the state of mind with which either comes to the perusal of such a book as Dr. Colenso's is quite different.

Now, we shall not surprise readers of the *Christian Remembrancer* if we say that we give our entire adhesion to the Catholic view on this point as opposed to the Protestant. We explained, in our last article on this subject, the meaning of the Sixth Article of Religion, and we challenge any one to give any other explanation of this Article which shall be at once consistent with common sense and the notorious facts of the case. And we say that the attitude of English Churchmen towards such questions ought to be quite as calm and serene as that of members of the Roman Communion is indifferent. It will at once be seen that we are preparing the way for the admission of unsolved difficulties in the text of Scripture. As regards the Old Testament, these are almost innumerable. Some of the difficulties of reconciling the accounts of the Kings and Chronicles appear to us to be very great or even insuperable. We gladly recognise attempts, whether by the aid of critical acumen or modern discoveries, to make an entirely consistent account of this period of Jewish history; but we fully believe that many of the difficulties will remain to the end of time. Many of them are known to the most superficial readers; many more make their way to the surface, as people become better acquainted with the subject. We need not repeat Bishop Butler's argument, that difficulties are to be expected in Revelation, if only on the very ground that there are difficulties in Nature. In Nature, Grace, and Revelation we may expect the same difficulties, and the same difficulty, or even impossibility in solving them. The point at present for considera-

tion is, that everybody has been familiar with many such difficulties, and that people in general do not seem to have minded them. Of course not. They have been content to think that they are not possessed of all knowledge or all science, and have left explanations to others who are wiser than themselves. The only real difference between the state of things now and that of fifty years ago is this, that a very few more difficulties have been dragged to light by modern critical researches, and that they have been thrown into a popular form, and published in the compass of a small volume, by a colonial Bishop, who has, moreover, unfortunately for himself, vastly overstated his case, and represented his argument as much stronger than even his friends, the Sceptics and Rationalists of Germany, will be able to admit.

And now, perhaps, we have said enough on the general bearing of the subject, and may proceed to give an account of the second part of the Bishop of Natal's book, the title of which is at the head of this article. We do not suppose that many of our readers will have been induced by our account of the first part of this work to read the work itself for themselves. And, probably, few readers of any kind will have followed the author through his weary details of arithmetical calculations. Suffice it, therefore, here to repeat, that Dr. Colenso occupied himself in the first part entirely in the work of destruction. We did not profess to follow each argument and to refute his conclusions *seriatim*; we gave what we supposed was a fair description of the book, and left it to tell its own story, only interspersing with our description of it such observations as might tend to elucidate the absurdity of the magnificent conclusion which the author professes to have deduced from the premises.

That conclusion was, that the whole story of the Exodus was unhistorical, neither written by Moses nor any other contemporary, but an entire fiction from beginning to end. We think we are not misrepresenting Dr. Colenso in saying this, because, whatever earlier stories the history of the Exodus may have been developed out of, it is plain that he considers the main story, and nearly every detail, to be pure invention.

However, before we proceed any further, the author shall recapitulate his first volume for himself.

He proceeds as follows:—

'Thus it is obvious that large portions of the Pentateuch, including the account of the Exodus itself (see E. x. 19, where the word "sea" is used for "west"), must have been composed long after the times of Moses and Joshua.'

'Further, it cannot be supposed that any later writers would have presumed to mix up, *without distinction*, large and important sections of history of their own composition, with writings so venerable and sacred, as any

must have been, which had been handed down from the time of Moses, and were really *believed* to have been written by his hands, and, chiefly, *from the very mouth of Jehovah Himself*. It is inconceivable that any pious Israelite, much less a Prophet or Priest, would have dared to commit an act of such profanity, under any circumstances. But, certainly, he could not have done so, without distinguishing in some way the Divine words, as written down by Moses, from his own.

There is not, however, a single instance of any such distinction being drawn throughout the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers; though in one or two places of Deuteronomy, xxxi. 30, xxxiii. 1, xxxiv., the expressions imply that a later writer is professedly setting forth the words or acts of Moses. And many of the signs of a later date, which we have just been considering, occur in passages, which must, if any, have been written by Moses himself, recording the words which Jehovah had spoken to him. We are compelled, therefore, it would seem, to the conclusion, that the later writer or writers did *not* believe in the unspeakably sacred character of any older documents, which may have come down to them—that they did *not* receive them, as really written by the hand of Moses, and conveying, on his own authority, the astonishing facts of his awful communion with God.

While, therefore, it is possible, as far as we know at present, that laws, songs, &c. may be included in the Pentateuch, which are of very ancient date, and may have even been handed down from the times of Moses, we can scarcely suppose that they were written by his hand, any more than we can believe that the whole story of the Exodus, containing, as we have seen, such flagrant contradictions, could have had Moses for its author. In short, without anticipating here the result of closer inquiry, observing only that the instances above adduced occur in so many different places as to cover, so to speak, the whole ground of the Mosaic story, we are warranted already in asserting that the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua, *generally*, must have been composed in a later age than that of Moses and Joshua, and some parts of them, at all events, not earlier than the time of Samuel (245) or of David (249).

And now it is worth while, before we go on to describe the contents of the second volume, to expose the fallacy contained in the view that later writers who added to the text of inspired documents could never have ventured so to tamper with them if they had believed them inspired. We ask, Why not? Supposing a later writer had believed himself to be inspired for this special work, where is the absurdity in his inserting, *ad libitum*, passages in the books of Moses—nay, why should not such a writer have conceived himself commissioned even to alter words and phrases to make them more intelligible to a later generation than archaic usages would have been. It will be said we are touching upon dangerous ground. Be it so. We do not assert anything positively, but we really cannot see any absurdity in the idea of inspired writers accommodating their expressions to the language of the time in which they wrote. Nay, is it not palpable and undeniable that they did so? Professors of the orthodox creed are often twitted with the insinuation that they silently veer round towards a view which is forced upon them by criticism. Now, if this means that they are open to

conviction, and can alter their opinions upon non-essential points of belief, such as the Church has not defined, we are free to confess that this is just the point at which we welcome criticism. It would be ridiculous to suppose that all the critical and scientific knowledge we of this age possess, which was wholly unknown in the last century, should have no effect upon the orthodox believer. It must be a very dead and useless creed that does not admit of indefinite expansion in the heart of him who professes it, as he grows in intellect as well as in grace. There are many points on which we ought to have clearer views than our forefathers in the faith had; and it would be an evil day for this generation if the spread of criticism is not to be accompanied with a corresponding increase in the numbers of those who adhere to the Catholic faith.

We beg to call the reader's attention to the transparent fallacy involved in the argument of the passage which we have extracted from the second part of 'The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined.' Of course, the Bishop of Natal does not believe in any kind of inspiration, as he denies even the truth of the narrative; but it should be observed, that his argument is professedly addressed to believers in some theory of inspiration, and he considers that any theory is shown by the above argument to be self-contradicting. Now, it would not have been worth while to waste so many words upon so palpable and ridiculous a fallacy, if it were not that we wish to impress upon the reader the extremely illogical character of the Bishop's mind. We have before shown that the conclusion which he professes to produce from the premises of his first volume is far beyond the truth of what they will bear, if all his facts were ever so fully proved and established. We have now shown that his idea of inspiration is so entirely confused, that he has tacked on a conclusion to premises with which it has nothing at all to do. We have stated the argument in the general, but even the most ordinarily instructed reader of the Old Testament has a hundred times applied it unconsciously to particular instances. It does not require more than the ordinary intelligence of a child, who has read the Books of Moses and Joshua, and who has been told that they were written respectively by Moses and Joshua, to ask the question how it comes to pass that the deaths of their authors are recorded in these books. The answer is easily given, and as easily accepted as truth, that additions were made, and the books reduced into the form in which we have them, principally by Ezra. It does not occur to him to doubt either the inspiration of Moses or of Ezra, because the one has been employed in the task of arranging, possibly altering, and certainly adding to what the other composed.

And now we proceed to notice the volume itself. And in doing so, perhaps, the best plan is, to exhibit the conclusion at which the Bishop of Natal has arrived in this second and constructive part of his work. Part the First must be considered as destructive, being occupied with the proof that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, nor Joshua the book which bears his name, and that the contents of these books are not true accounts of what actually happened. Dr. Colenso does not claim absolute certainty for his conclusions. He is content to say, that the Pentateuch most probably originated in a noble effort of one illustrious man, in an early age of the Hebrew history (early, in this case, meaning four centuries after the time when the Exodus is usually supposed to have taken place), to train his people in the faith and fear of the Living God. This illustrious individual is represented as basing a fictitious history on floating legends and traditions, and drawing upon his own imagination for details when tradition failed him. The Book was left in an unfinished state, and completed by other prophetic or priestly writers. This illustrious individual was called Samuel, and to him we owe about half of the book of Genesis and a small part of Exodus. The greater part of the rest of the Pentateuch, exclusive of Deuteronomy, and such portions of the earlier books as are called by the author Elohistic, we owe to the pens of Nathan and Gad, or some other prophetic or priestly writers of that and the following age. The author does not tell us how these writers came to be priests and prophets; but let that pass. This may have been a pious fraud, similar to the composition of a history which the authors knew to be false, and which they must have known every person of common sense would have known to be false. The author continues: 'But though, as we believe, these portions of the Pentateuch were written, the history gives no sign of the Pentateuch itself being in existence in the age of Samuel, David, or Solomon—much less of the Levitical laws being in full operation, *known, honoured, revered, obeyed, even quoted or referred to*—as the contents of a book, believed to be Mosaic and Divine, would certainly have been, at least by the most pious persons of the day!'

Dr. Colenso is not so blind but what he can see that his theory *seems* to impute bad faith and falsehood to the great prophet. He introduces the objection with a pretty rhetorical artifice. A friend, it appears, observed to him, 'I would rather believe that two and two make five than that such a man as Samuel could possibly have been guilty of so foul an offence against the laws of religion, truth, and common morality.' Now, we are not concerned to defend the mode of expression, which, however, we will take the liberty of saying, we make no objection to. We

suppose Dr. Colenso could not brook such an offence against the four rules of arithmetic. We are content to see, in the strong language used, the protest of one who will not consent, under any amount of difficulties exhibited to him, to part with the faith he has been brought up in, and the hopes he has cherished. However, the Bishop of Natal makes a point out of the expression, 'two and two making five,' which leaves no other impression on the mind of the reader than a floating doubt, whether the story was not invented for the occasion. Certainly, if we were to accuse Dr. Colenso of this, it would be a mild form of accusation compared with the extensive charges of a similar kind which he prefers against the prophet Samuel. However, setting such trifling as this apart, it is really unworthy of any one who pretends to philosophical investigation, to introduce such an *ad captandum* argument, as one which proceeds on the supposition that there really exist people who would or could believe that two and two make five, whoever might state such a proposition, or wherever it might appear.

In truth, the Bishop is forced into some such rhetorical method, from sheer want of ability to answer the objection which he supposes to arise, and which of course inevitably must arise, upon his theory being propounded. It sounds grand and impressive to begin the answer by saying: 'It is not I who require you to abandon the ordinary notion of the Mosaic authorship and antiquity of the Pentateuch: it is the TRUTH itself which does so.' But, in point of fact, we in vain attempt to discover any palliation of the guilt involved in the invention of such a story as that of the Jewish history by Samuel, supposing that history not to be a true record of events. It is not argument, but mere declamation, to say that 'instead of characterising the act of Samuel as an impudent fraud, rather the person of the aged seer will loom out from those ancient times with a grandeur and distinctness more remarkable than ever. Like our own King Alfred, he will in that case have to be regarded as the great regenerator of his people, a model himself of intellectual activity and vigour, of patriotic zeal and religious earnestness.'

The defence, such as it is, consists in the allegation that the author only charges the prophet with the composition of a romance, the story of which rests upon some obscure facts as a basis; that he supposes him to have composed this narrative for the instruction and improvement of his pupils, as an historical experiment, which he never intended to pass as a record of *matter-of-fact, veracious history*. We are nowhere informed by Dr. Colenso how the stupendous miracle came to pass of these books being in later days regarded not as true only, but 'infal-libly divine.' This is a fair specimen of the trumpery which is

passed off for argument in this volume. The reader's question will be no longer as to the logic of the Bishop of Natal, but as to his sanity. Is it conceivable that a man in his right senses can justify the invention of such a story, of direct communication between the Almighty and the Hebrew Lawgiver, as we have in the Books of Moses, for the sake of consolidating a nation and educating a people. Yet such is actually the plea put in in behalf of the prophet Samuel; and it is further propped up by reference to the parallel cases of Minos, Lycurgus, and Numa, 'who are said to have been actuated by the purest desire for the welfare of their countrymen, and to have sought to attach authority to their lessons and laws by representing them as revealed supernaturally or, at least, as divinely approved.' One word more as regards the conclusion which the author professes to have established, before we notice the flimsy foundation upon which the superstructure has been raised. It seems he has advanced a step beyond what he contemplated in his first volume. He has now reached so far as to be willing to give up the faith itself, if the inexorable demands of his own logical powers shall demand it. We have somewhere seen a caution to the effect that Christians must not even allow, if so be, an angel from heaven to seduce them by proclaiming another gospel; but here we have an ordinary mortal bidding us give up the essentials of the faith if argument should seem to overthrow them. Let it not be said we are misrepresenting the author. We believe we are simply commenting upon his very plain words. They are as follows:—

'There is nothing to prevent our receiving the narrative as bringing to us lessons of like significance—as being "profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness"—whether, with Abraham, we are called to go forth, at the voice of Truth which is God's voice, into a strange land which we know not, but where He will assuredly meet with us and bless us, or to be ready to sacrifice, if need be, at the bidding of the same supreme authority, the *dearest object of our hope, the most cherished tenet of our faith*, "accounting that God is able to raise it up even from the dead," to give us a brighter hope, and a surer ground of confidence in His Faithfulness and Love, than ever,—or whether, with Moses, we are to be taught to stand before the gulf of difficulty, when the path of duty lies plainly forward, but there seems no passage in front, no way of escape to the right or to the left, and then to be able to say, "Fear not, stand still, and ye shall see the salvation of God." These particular acts may never have occurred: but similar acts *have* occurred, and *are* occurring daily. And these stand forth in the Mosaic narrative, as, indeed, does the whole march through the wilderness, as records of the writer's experience in the past, and types of the daily experience of mankind.'

Now, we shall leave all this rhodomontade to speak for itself, merely suggesting to the reader that, if the 'most cherished tenet of our faith' should happen to be the doctrine of the Resurrection, he will have to choose for himself whether, with

S. Paul, he will consider himself and his fellow-Christians the most miserable of men, or whether he will be content with the vain hope that this shallow and impertinent reasoner holds out to him that God is able to substitute something else that will do as well to sustain the drooping faith which will not believe what is not mathematically demonstrated.

One word more in reply to an objection that may be raised against what we have been urging. It will be said that we have been taking Bishop Colenso's conclusions and showing what they tend to; that we are pointing out the inevitable consequences of the argument—viz. that disbelief in the Divine authority of Moses issues in disbelief in the Divine mission of Christ. And we plead guilty to the charge. In the first place, we are not now professing to give a satisfactory account of either the real or the fictitious difficulties presented in this volume; neither have we adopted the style of argument without being provoked to it. We have but accepted Dr. Colenso's challenge, and declined to accept his premises, because they inevitably lead to a conclusion which is not the less certain because the writer is too illogical to discern the connexion between them. We must, however, do the author the justice to admit that he points out one apparent defect in Samuel's honesty. Samuel is supposed to be the author, as we have said, of the Elohist portions of the narrative. Now, Dr. Colenso is in this difficulty: According to him, it is next to certain that the introduction of the name is of the age of Samuel; and therefore, if so, in all probability that it owes its origin to himself. No doubt, if this is the case, the prophet is convicted of a downright lie, for in the sixth chapter of Exodus an earlier origin is undoubtedly assigned to it. It does not strike us as at all a stronger case than is presented by the whole of the rest of the history. But the defence which the author institutes for Samuel on the ground that, after all, there is probably some basis of fact to go upon here, upon his own showing, entirely breaks down. The author is content to observe that 'we might have wished that it 'were possible to suppose that the account of the revelation of 'the name of Jehovah in Exodus was also based upon legendary 'matter of fact—that there were any clear signs of the 'existence of the word among the Hebrew tribes in an earlier 'age than that of Samuel.' But, alas! truth compels him to admit that there are no such indications. How the following observations bear upon the point we are at a loss to conceive; but the author appears to think that the seer did not ascribe to the word the same fulness and depth of meaning as we do at the present day, and that this supposition alleviates the guilt of his representing the invention of the name as some centuries

earlier than it really existed. What the meaning of the name as understood in the time of Samuel or in Christian times has to do with the question of matter of fact, as to its having been said to be in existence three or four centuries earlier than it really did exist, we leave to the sagacity of our readers to discover.

And here we leave Dr. Colenso's conclusions, and will proceed to give a brief account of the meagre way in which they are established.

After briefly summing up, in the opening chapter, the general run of his argument, minus the arithmetical calculations, he proceeds with his work of construction. The destructive part which is recapitulated amounts to this: that such a large body of men, in passing through the desert, must have wanted *water, firewood, grass, and salt*. The author confines his remarks to what he considers the necessities of life: so coffee and whisky—which the residents in the Southern States of America have learned to do without—are not mentioned in the enumeration. The constructive part of the work then begins with an account of the distinction of writers, which, probably, most of our readers will be familiar with, into Elohistic and Jehovistic. To account for the use of the words, Jehovah, Elohim, and the combination of the two, has exercised the powers of every recent commentator on the books of the Pentateuch. All that we can gather from our author in this chapter is, that he is dissatisfied with Hengstenberg's explanations, as well as with those of every other commentator; and, we suppose, he will not himself claim to have proved anything more, though we fail of seeing the proof, than that there were two distinct writers, it being, as he concludes, most reasonable to believe, that some great event in the ancient history of the Hebrew people, of which a traditionary recollection was retained among them, may have given to the Elohist the idea of his work, and been made by him the basis of his story. We do not attempt to determine here what amount of truth, if any, there may be in the theory that Moses, in compiling his narrative of the early history of the world, made use of written documents composed in some previous age. We do not profess to possess the learning requisite for such a task, neither need we here say a word as to how far any reliable theory of inspiration would be reconcileable with such views; but it is worth our while to observe, that whilst the German critics—from whom our author borrows so extensively—are altogether at issue about the character and number of these early historians—some having thought that, instead of two, there were several writers, whose hands may be traced in the variety of expressions in the Pentateuch—Dr. Colenso's view is, that there are, of course, two, and two only, one of whom is

called the Elohist, the other the Jehovist. We notice this point because this appears to be essential to the argument, whereas there is no sort of evidence produced that the Pentateuch is the work of only two writers. Having destroyed the evidence of unity of composition, the dualism of the writer is taken for granted, as if there were no alternative, and as if no one had ever suggested that there were three or four different hands concerned in the business.

After having settled to his own satisfaction, if not to that of his readers, the case of the Elohist and Jehovist writers, the author proceeds to give some account, first of the earlier, secondly of the later, books of the Old Testament. Of the next two chapters, which are devoted to the subject, it does not appear necessary to say more than that an attempt is made to show, from internal evidence, that they are of late date; and amongst other interesting pieces of information, we learn that the works of Ezra and Nehemiah were written after the transactions in which these eminent persons took so active a part.

Neither, again, is it necessary for us to follow our author minutely through the two following chapters, which are headed respectively—'Signs of later date in the Pentateuch,' and 'Additional signs of later date in the Pentateuch.' It will be sufficient here to say, that all the well-known passages are picked out which have been always recognised as being the addition of a later hand; and several others are added, the history of which is, to say the least, very doubtful; and the conclusion announced, not that these passages are of later date, but the whole of the Pentateuch is so. At the risk of being charged with giving our readers no credit for intellect, we will give one instance. Take the passage Deut. xxxiv. 6—'No man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.'

Everybody knows that the number of such passages as these is very great, both in the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. Such passages were undoubtedly inserted by a later hand. Their very frequency is a proof that the later hand wrote naturally and without fear of suspicion. Whether or not other passages in the same volume were written contemporaneously with them is a point which must be settled by referring to such passages. This much is certain, that if they had been written by the same hand, it was never in the least degree probable that they would have been attributed, as they universally have been, to an earlier writer—unless, indeed, the later writer meant to deceive; and if he had meant to deceive, he took the very worst conceivable method of doing so, by mixing up, in almost inextricable confusion, his own with the earlier writer's expressions; some passages being, like the one we are now speaking about,

plainly his own; some as plainly professing to be the earlier writer's, and some, probably, being of such a nature that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish the hand. To put the argument plainly: If it had been a matter of the faith that Moses wrote every word of the Pentateuch, Dr. Colenso's argument would be good. As it is, it is quite worthless, because it only proves, at the very utmost, that there are more passages added by Ezra, or some other writer, than perhaps the reader had found out for himself. We say, 'at the very utmost,' because we demur to the argument founded upon many of the passages quoted.

Thus, for instance, it is mere trifling to quote such a passage as the following, and say that it could hardly have been written by Moses (Exod. xi. 3):—'Moreover, the man Moses was very 'great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh's servants, 'and in the sight of his people.' It would be quite as reasonable to argue that S. Paul was not the author of the second Epistle to the Corinthians, because in it the sentence occurs—'I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles.'

And such is the case at the end of the sixth chapter, for the bold proposal which heads the seventh—'Was Samuel the Elohist writer of the Pentateuch?' If Moses and Joshua were not the authors of the first six books of the Canon, Samuel probably was the writer, for this reason—'there is no 'one mentioned in the whole history, before the time of Samuel, 'who could be supposed to have written any part of it.' We will just insert here, by the way, that if the evidence for Samuel breaks down, we shall then be obliged to fall back upon Joshua and Moses. However, not to anticipate, the author, in addition to this negative argument, that he cannot find any other author, alleges in behalf of Samuel, that he is known to have occupied himself with historical labours. Well, if a person wrote one book of history he might, of course, have written another; and, undoubtedly, we are told in the First Book of Chronicles, chap. xxix 29.—'Now the acts of David the king, 'first and last, behold, they are written in the book of Samuel 'the seer, and in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the 'book of Gad the seer.' It is a pity that the author invalidates the force of his argument by telling us that no reliance can be placed on the statements of the Chronicler when unsupported by other evidence. However, in this particular instance, that Samuel was a writer of history, we have, fortunately, a piece of corroborative evidence in a verse of the First Book of Samuel, x. 25. where it is said—'Samuel told the people the 'manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up 'before Jehovah.'

However, we do not think there is any necessity to dispute the point ; we are quite willing to concede that Samuel was a historian, and that in such a work he may have been aided by the 'sons of the prophets'—perhaps even, it is probable that Samuel may have gathered in those schools some of the more promising young men of his time, and may have endeavoured to train them, to the best of his power, in such knowledge of every kind as he himself had acquired—the art of *writing*, it may be, among the rest. We have no objection to urge against the supposition, regarded in the general. What we fail to perceive is any very cogent evidence for ascribing to Samuel the Elohist portions of Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, together with a very small portion of Deuteronomy, and Joshua. Not to misrepresent our author, it is fair to say that he does not consider this point as distinctly proved as yet ; he only ascribes it to Samuel, to use his own words, 'provisionally and tentatively.'

The next few chapters, down to the end of the eighteenth, are devoted to the confirmation of this provisional and tentative hypothesis. We can only give the most cursory account of this confirmation. It consists, in point of fact, of an elaborate examination of the whole Book of Psalms, with the view of classing them under early and late compositions of the time of David. The author attempts, with more or less success, to show that in the earlier ones the use of the name Elohim preponderates over that of Jehovah, whilst, in the latter, the reverse of this takes place. To establish this conclusion, which it is not in point here either to endorse or to attempt to refute, a number of suppositions of different degrees of probability have to be made, a number of ugly facts which militate against it have to be disposed of, and Dr. Colenso has to express his agreement or disagreement, as the case may be, with his German critics—upon the whole agreeing more often with the sceptical than the more orthodox commentators. Let us for a moment suppose the fact proved, that, in the earlier Psalms composed by David, the form Elohim predominates, whilst, in the latter, the name Jehovah is far more prominent ; and, without alluding to the various reasons which might be assigned for so interesting a fact, we submit that, after all, it is but a hypothetical explanation of the fact, that the name Jehovah was becoming gradually more familiar during the life of David. However, we will state the author's own claim, which is as follows. The nineteenth chapter begins with the following words :—

'The inference from the above seems to be plain, in complete accordance with our previous supposition, viz. that the word 'Jehovah had been but recently formed, or, at least, but newly adopted and introduced by some great, wise, and patriotic

‘master-mind—very probably, Samuel’s—at the time when David came to the throne, with the special purpose, probably, of consolidating and maintaining the civil and religious unity of the Hebrew tribes, under the new experiment of the kingdom.’

We must not do the Bishop of Natal the injustice to represent this as the whole of his case. It is, indeed, the main and principal part of it, but there is one other supplementary argument upon which he relies. He proceeds to examine the names which, by their resemblance in their letters and derivations to Elohim and Jehovah respectively, will give some evidence as to the commonness of the use of these two appellatives of the Almighty; and, upon the whole, he concludes that ‘there is no single instance in the authentic history from the time of Moses downwards to that of Samuel, which can be appealed to as distinctly showing that the name Jehovah was used in the formation of proper names in those days—except the cases of Joshua and Jochebed.’

The author adds his conviction, that though the name of Jehovah may possibly have been used before, it certainly was not commonly employed, and that Samuel was the first to introduce the name, perhaps in imitation of some Egyptian name of the Deity which may have reached his ears—the probability of some such origin being suggested by the fact that there was free ‘intercourse between the residents in Palestine and the Egyptians, and that Samuel’s own sons were stationed as judges in Beersheba, a town in the extreme south of Palestine, on the frontier of Egypt.’ There is a stumbling-block in the way of this theory in the ‘thoroughly Jehovistic’ Song of Deborah, which, however, is comfortably set aside by the observation that ‘it is inconceivable that, if the word Jehovah was used so freely at *that* time, David should have used it so sparingly till a late period of his life; and the Song of Deborah is, accordingly, assigned to a date corresponding to the close of David’s life, the writer being described as one who, except in the free use of the word Jehovah, has produced an admirable imitation of an ancient song, a “Lay of Ancient Israel,” and thrown himself thoroughly into the spirit of the age which he describes.’

In the twentieth chapter, this notion of the gradual introduction of the name Jehovah in the days of Samuel is further illustrated by a comparison of the number of names compounded with *El* in the First Book of Samuel with those in the Second Book which are formed from Jehovah. And such is an outline of the argument. It is quite possible that the author may feel himself aggrieved by its being represented in outline, and so, necessarily, without a number of details which have been elabo-

rately worked out and ingeniously wrought together into a theory. The effect of the argument, it will be said, depends upon the amount of facts brought to support it, and the suppressing them injures the force of the argument. We are well aware of the truth of such an allegation as this. We can only say that, in a review of a work so full of facts, it is impossible to do anything else than state them as a whole.

Probably some of our readers, to whom the facts are new, would be surprised to find so large an array, which seems to fall in with the hypothesis, even after making the large deductions that must be made from the author's enumeration, and after making allowance for arguments, which look very much like the logical fallacy called the 'argument in a circle.' For the information of such, we have to observe, that we are not impugning the author's ingenuity, any more than we are defending his originality. The supposition of Samuel being the author of the Pentateuch had been made and refuted before Dr. Colenso was ever heard of; and the defence of the hypothesis, on the distinction made between Elohist and Jehovist writers, has exercised many understandings more profound than his. The praise to which he is entitled is that of having ingeniously put together, in a small compass, the whole of the argument as against the Mosaic authorship and in favour of Samuel's having been the compiler. He is further entitled to whatever credit may attach to the fact that he is the first person who has ventured to claim the right of a Christian Bishop to exercise his authority in a Church which demands of her clergy unfeigned belief in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament, which, if there is any truth in his argument, are demonstrated to contain a parcel of lies. In thus characterising the argument, we are using our own words, and not those of the Bishop of Natal. His own representation of matters is as follows:—

'We have thus something like firm ground to stand upon, as the result of this inquiry, and can at once account for many of the strange phenomena, which we observe in the Pentateuch. The earliest portions of it, including the account of the Exodus itself, or, rather, as we shall see, *the first scanty sketch of it*, were written four hundred years, at least, after the supposed time of the Exodus, three hundred of which, according to the story, passed amidst the stormy and disorderly period of the Judges, which can only be compared with the worst times of Anglo-Saxon England. The chronology, indeed, of the Judges is, notoriously, very confused and contradictory; and it is quite possible that *a much shorter space of time* than three hundred years may really have elapsed, since the movement took place, which, as we believe, lay at the basis of the Elohist narrative. During that period, however, it seems very unlikely that any historical records were written, or, if written, were preserved,—preserved by *whom?* Later writers, at all events, mention no historians of earlier date than Samuel, Nathan, and Gad; so that whoever wrote the Book of Judges wrote, most probably, from the mere legends and traditions of the people.

"Thus, then, it is not necessary to suppose that the narrative of Samuel is a pure fiction, an invention of the Prophet's own imagination, in short, merely a "pious fraud." It is very possible that there may have been, as we have said, floating about in the memories of the Hebrew tribes, many legendary stories of their ancestors, and of former great events in their history,—how they once fled in a large body out of Egypt, under an eminent leader, such as Moses,—how they had been led through that "great and terrible wilderness," had encamped under the dreadful Mount, with its blackened peaks and precipices, as if they had been burnt with fire (83),—how they had lost themselves in the dreary waste, and struggled on through great sufferings, and many died, but the rest fought their way at last into the land of Canaan, and made good their footing among the tribes which they found there, by whom they were called Hebrews, that is, people who had "crossed" the Jordan. Precisely the same expression is used by the natives of Natal in speaking of those Zulus, who from time to time have been driven by fear, or have migrated for other reasons, from their native land lying to the north of the British colony, and "crossed" the large frontier river, the Tugela, into the Natal district, either before or after it came under British rule. It is quite customary to speak of them, simply as *abavelayo*, "people who have crossed," or, perhaps, the movement may be more closely defined, "who crossed with Umpande," or whoever the principal person may have been.

'It is conceivable that the recollections of that terrible march may have left indelible traces on the minds of the people, and may have been exaggerated, as is the case with legends generally, while circulated in their talk, and passed on by word of mouth, from sire to son, in the intervening age. In this way, natural facts may have been magnified into prodigies, and a few thousand multiplied into two millions of people. It is quite possible that the passage of the Red Sea, the manna, the quails, and other miracles, may thus have had a real historical foundation, as will be shown more fully in our critical review of the different Books of the Pentateuch. And Samuel may have desired to collect these legends, and make them the basis of a narrative, by which he, being dead, might yet speak to them with a Prophet's voice, and, while rejected by them himself as a ruler, might yet be able patriotically to help forward their civil and religious welfare under kingly government, and more especially under the rule of his favourite David, whose deep religious feeling accorded with his own sentiments so much more fully than the impetuous, arbitrary character of Saul. His annual journeys of assize, when "he went from year to year in circuit to Bethel, and Gilgal, and Mizpeh, and judged Israel in all those places," 1 S. vii. 16, would have given him good opportunities for gathering such stories, as well as for knowing thoroughly the different parts and places of the country, to which such legends were attached. He may have spent a great part of his life, especially the latter part of it since Saul came to the throne, and he was himself relieved from the cares of government, in the elaboration of such a work as this, filling up from his own mind, we may conceive, the blanks left in such legendary accounts, and certainly imparting to them their high religious tone and spiritual character.'

Well, we think it must in all fairness be admitted, that the Bishop of Natal has not made out a very good case for Samuel. We think, therefore, we might fairly turn round upon him and say, If that is the case for ascribing the authorship of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua to Samuel, it is an entire failure; and if so, there is, on your own showing, no

other person who is the least likely to have made such a compilation in that age. However, a thing may be true, though it cannot be proved. So let us go on to see what there is to be said against Samuel's authorship. In the first place, we take it for granted that, just as in the present article it has been shown that Dr. Colenso has made a very poor case in favour of Samuel, so in our last number (see *Christian Remembrancer* for January, 1863) we showed that he made no case at all against Moses. We have every right, therefore, to insist that Moses is in possession of the ground, because the authorship has always been attributed to him from the earliest times of which we have any independent records. And here, if we could not make the case stronger, we should be quite content to leave it. But, in point of fact, insuperable objections may be shown against every theory that has ever been invented of a later authorship of these books. It would be by no means an unprofitable study of the contents of the Old Testament, to prove the absurdity of any later period that could be suggested; but, undoubtedly, if we were obliged to maintain any thesis but the true one on this subject, we should fix upon the time of Josiah, and ascribe the invention to Hilkiah the high priest. A little ingenuity might make out a far better case than anything we have found in these dreary volumes. It would, perhaps, be a profitable exercise for a student of Old Testament history to rip up this hypothesis from the internal evidence that may be produced from the Old Testament history. But our present business is with the Prophet Samuel, and not with Hilkiah the Priest; and, setting aside the morality of such a forgery as is ascribed to him, we say, he could not have well invented a story more unfavourable to his purpose. He must have wished it to be received as true history, or at least as probable. The story is full of the grossest improbabilities, in the way of miraculous interference. Moreover, the history recorded in the eighth chapter of the First Book of Samuel, which, on the present hypothesis, we must take as authentic, becomes utterly ridiculous. We are there told that the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and complained that Samuel's sons perverted judgment, and accordingly, being dissatisfied, they request him to make them a king. The influential position occupied by Samuel does not admit of any other supposition than that he was one of the wisest men of his day. If, therefore, he had invented a history, it would have been such a history as would have suited his purpose. It is plain that Samuel was extremely unwilling to allow the people to have a king; it would, therefore, have been of the utmost importance to him to have documents which were believed, and to which he could refer, which should have enabled him authoritatively to

refuse the wish of the people. Now, the history is, upon the whole, such as would have helped him in making out a case against the desirableness of having a king. The government is represented as having always been a theocracy—rulers, governors, judges, captains, and the like, having their authority, not by any hereditary right, but direct from God, who is, from time to time at least, personally interfering in His people's behalf, whether in a way which may be called miraculous or not. Now, nearly the whole antecedent history of the Jewish nation is a kind of standing protest against the kingly government; and it will be said to be an indication of great sagacity and wisdom on Samuel's part that it is so represented that he could appeal to it in this way. He evidently wished to prevent, if possible, the establishment of a dynasty of kings; and his object must have been to preserve his own relation to the people as judge, and to keep the people obedient, in the view that he was in constant and immediate communication with Almighty God. The history shows that he was unsuccessful: the people were too strong for him, and prevailed upon him to set a king over them. So far, it is all very reasonable, it will be said. He did his best to prevent the foreseen probability of the people being clamorous for a king. No man can insure success; and Samuel, with all his sagacity, was beaten. The people were too strong for him; and all his representations of the glories of their past history on all occasions when they had been obedient to God and His chosen leaders, as well as the warnings of their failures when they followed their own devices, went for nothing. It was a good attempt, and ought to have succeeded if anything could succeed; but a people's self-will sometimes proceeds beyond all bounds, and baffles the profoundest wisdom and the most penetrating sagacity of lawgiver or statesman. But what statesman, we ask, in Samuel's position, ever could have invented an actual provision for the very case which he laboured so much, and so earnestly desired, to prevent? What statesman would have thought of forging a document which contains a prophecy of the very event which he deprecated, and a sort of allowance for, and justification of, a step which he does not hesitate to speak of as a rebellion against himself and his God? The passage we are referring to is as follows:—

‘When thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me; thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose: one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother. But he shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the

end that he should multiply horses: forasmuch as the Lord hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way. Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away: neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold. And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites: and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them: that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren, and that he turn not aside from the commandment, to the right hand, or to the left: to the end that he may prolong his days in his kingdom, he, and his children, in the midst of Israel.'

Now, this passage is even of more importance to our argument than we have yet represented it. Supposing it should be said that Samuel found the change of government inevitable, and, being anxious to make the best of matters, pretended that the passage in Deuteronomy was of Divine authority, in order to restrict the power of the king as much as he could, and as it referred to such vices as were likely to prevail, and which did in fact prevail in the case of Saul and in that of Solomon, we ask, Is it at all likely that Saul, who all the latter part of his life was at issue with Samuel, and must have known of the invention of the history if it had not been true, would still have regarded Samuel with the awe which he manifested towards him? Would he not have instantly exposed his pretensions to a Divine authority for these books? And is it not, to say the least, probable that he would have succeeded in averting the transfer of his government to Samuel's nominee. Even in Solomon's time, it is certain that the arrogant pretensions of such books, if not true, must have been exposed; for Solomon, by falling into the very fault that is predicted in the passage above quoted, would have the greatest interest in showing up pretensions which, even in that day, at the interval of scarcely more than a single generation, could have been proved to be false. It must be remembered, moreover, that this very forgery enjoined upon the king, not only to write a copy of the law, but also to keep it by him and read therein all the days of his life. Such a passage as the above is simply fatal to the hypothesis of Samuel having been the writer of the Mosaic history.

NOTICES.

A FRENCH journalist of the name of Hector Malot—one of the contributors, if we mistake not, to the *Opinion Nationale*—has been publishing what he calls '*La Vie moderne en Angleterre*' (Paris: Michel Levy frères). If not quite as lively and as imaginative as M. Larcher, whose '*L'Angleterre, Londres et les Anglais*' we noticed a year ago, he is very lively and imaginative nevertheless. The '*Vie moderne*' was originally contributed to a newspaper; but though its author himself informs us that he has seen or learnt but little in England, he has considered that little so valuable that he has thought it worth his while to reproduce it in the present shape. His work is divided into eleven chapters, with the following headings: '*La vie matérielle—Les journaux—Le théâtre—Le sport—L'instruction—Les volontaires—Le Dimanche—Les Anglaises—Le Roman—Londres la nuit—La Ville.*' It contains also a dedication, an introduction, and an appendix. Most of these chapters are full of information which will doubtless prove as novel to Englishmen as it has to Frenchmen, and they contain also not a few contradictions. M. Malot supplies us with many stories and anecdotes about English life and about himself, but most of them we take to exist only in our French journalist's lively, and not always very pure, imagination. He also frequently indulges in attempts at wit and *plaisanterie*, but his wit, such as it is, is usually in very bad taste, and his *plaisanterie* is as *lourde* as the *pâte* of which he speaks. As to his knowledge of English, it seems on a par with his other acquirements. Even when M. Malot speaks the truth, he mixes up a good deal of nonsense with it; and when he praises an object, he is sure to find at the same time something to detract. True, he contrasts favourably several things in this country with the same things in his own, but he appears to do so only the better to find fault with us for something else. We will give a few specimens of M. Malot's style of writing and blunders taken almost at random. '*A Londres,*' says he, '*les hôtels de premier ordre sont très-beaux, ou plus justement très-bons; seulement la vie y est un peu chère: habiter le West-End ou Westminster coûte quarante, cinquante, cent francs par jour. Habiter Leicester square, où les hôtels français sont nombreux, coûte douze ou quinze francs. Seulement il faut observer que Leicester square n'est point un quartier aristocratique et respectable, comme disent les Anglais.*' (P. 24.) M. Malot is fully entitled to speak of Leicester Square and its hotels; but we doubt whether he knows anything of those of Westminster or of the West-End. Further on, after having informed us that the '*cuisine anglaise*' is '*très-simple,*' and that usually '*la nourriture se compose de bœuf ou de mouton rôti,*' or rather '*bouilli,*' as well as of boiled fish, he adds—'*Pour varier ces mets substantiels, on a des pâtisseries à la rhubarbe; la pâte est lourde comme un morceau de plomb, et gluante comme un morceau de savon. Ces mets se servent sans assaisonnement; chacun fait le sien à sa guise. Pour cela on apporte devant chaque convive une sorte d'huilier à six ou huit compartiments dans lesquels se trouvent tous les condiments de la terre, ce qu'il y a de plus violent en épices et en excitants. L'huile seule est oubliée; c'est trop fade pour un gosier anglais; d'ailleurs on ne l'emploie point pour la salade, qui se mange le plus souvent au sel, ou quelquefois avec une sauce blanche brûlante comme le vitriol, qui se conserve dans des flacons contournés comme des serpents.*' (P. 38.)

M. Malot has some most curious observations, as well as descriptions, interspersed with great prodigality in all his chapters; but the chapters entitled '*Les Anglaises*' and '*Le Dimanche*' are peculiarly rich in them. We decline to give any extracts from the former, they are scarcely fit to give. M. Malot concludes it by saying, that '*si les Anglais voulaient s'allier aux*

'Françaises, et les Français aux Anglaises de cette union naîtrait une race qui étonnerait le monde qu'elle dominerait.' During the whole of his sojourn in London, our author seems to have suffered dreadfully from that 'terrible jour de la semaine' called Sunday. However, he thinks it right to mention, that he was never left without anything to eat 'dans ce jour redoutable,' or reduced to enter a chemist's shop, and there to 'tromper sa faim avec quelques livres de pâte de guimauve;' 'mais—he considerably adds—'ce n'est pas à dire que le Dimanche soit à Londres un jour de plaisir et de festins: il s'en faut!' With the theatres, music-halls, and 'lieux de divertissement de toute nature' closed, what was poor M. Malot to do during the whole of that 'jour redoutable'? Even the usual recreations of Leicester Square were insufficient for him on that day. His great amusement seems to have been to listen to street and park preachers, of whom, according to him, there is a large variety in the metropolis. 'Sans doute,' he says, 'on prêche en plein air dans la semaine... mais la grande, la vraie, la puissante prédication est celle du Dimanche. *Et qui donc prêche ainsi? tout le monde; tous ceux qui ont la langue bien pendue et la salive abondante; des lords, des cordonniers, des tailleurs, surtout des tailleurs.*' (P. 182.) M. Malot, blushing with native modesty, quietly affirms that he has seen and learnt very little in England; we must acknowledge that he has seen and learnt a great deal, and that very much to the purpose. We should, however, be scarcely doing full justice to our accomplished traveller, and to his accurate and extensive knowledge of the English language and of English life, if we omitted giving one or two additional extracts from his first chapter, which includes an account of his journey to London from Paris. His fellow-travellers are thus described: 'Dans le wagon qui nous emportait de Paris pour Boulogne, j'étais le seul Français; auprès de moi étaient trois jeunes filles plus ou moins jolies, dont les cheveux pâles et frisans, les yeux bleus abrités par de longs cils, les joues fraîches et douces comme une feuille de rose, les pieds longs et mal chaussés, disaient clairement la nationalité; en face, j'avais un gentleman aux cheveux blancs, haut en couleur, carré des épaules, vigoureux, bien portant, bien nourri, un vrai type d'Anglo-Saxon.' (P. 13.) The ingenious chronicler informs us further how these young ladies spent their time during the *trajet*. Of course they were carefully provided with the brandy bottle—that indispensable accompaniment of English ladies, according to writers of the stamp of Larcher and Malot:—'Depuis Paris elles étaient fort occupées à manger des gâteaux; pendant les moments de repos elles respiraient le sel et se passaient sur la figure des mouchoirs trempés dans de l'eau de Cologne; de temps en temps elles tiraient d'un splendide trousse de voyage une assez grande bouteille en cristal fermée avec un bouchon armorié, et elles se versaient dans un gobelet en vermeil une liqueur qu'a la couleur et a l'odeur j'aurais prise pour de la vulgaire eau-de-vie, si j'avais été un Français hostile à l'Angleterre.' (P. 17.) As to the English gentleman, he seems, according to the authority before us, to have been occupied in praising and abusing his own country by turns, and in teaching M. Malot how to behave when in England. 'Un étranger,' says M. Malot's Englishman, 'lors même qu'il est un homme du monde et qu'il sait l'anglais [which is certainly not the case with the *étranger* before us, who is evidently the person referred to], peut être exposé, en arrivant chez nous, aux mésaventures les plus désagréables. Cela tient à deux causes:—d'abord à ce que les Anglais, voyant peu d'étrangers, sont par cela impitoyables pour tout ce qui n'est point taillé sur leur propre patron, qui naturellement est à leurs yeux parfait;—ensuite, à ce que lorsqu'une société est malade et corrompue, il lui faut, pour se soutenir, inventer des règles tout à fait arbitraires. C'est ainsi que nous avons créé une loi sociale qui se résume dans ces deux mots: *It is shocking, it is not proper.*

' (*Proper* se prononce, pour les hommes et pour les femmes, en baissant les yeux et en ramenant plus ou moins haut la main au-devant du visage, comme pour se cacher pudiquement [!!].)

— 'Savez-vous, continua-t-il, ce qui est *proper*, ce qui est *shocking* ?

— 'Ma foi, pas trop.

— 'Eh bien, vous verrez ce qu'il en coûte pour l'ignorer.

' Puis, me regardant avec une sorte de compassion où il y avait bien aussi un peu de mépris :

— 'Tenez, reprit-il, si vous ne voulez pas être *shocking*, ne parlez jamais de *schiff* [sic] (chemise de femme), de *belly* (ventre) ; si vous souffrez dans cet endroit, dites : *I have PEINE* [sic] in my stomach . . . Quand vous parlez de votre culotte, remplacez *breeches*, qui est le vrai mot, par *small clothes* (petits habillements)' (pp. 17, 18).

Our complacent and veracious traveller does not tell us what the young ladies were doing while all this interesting information was being communicated to him by his English instructor. There is much more in the book to the same effect, but we will not transcribe it. None but a Frenchman could write such a book ; and none but Frenchmen could take in the pitiable trash it contains.

The 'Lettre de Mgr. l'Evêque d'Orléans demandant une quête générale en faveur des pauvres ouvriers rouennais' (Paris : Douniol), is a bulkier and more elaborate production. The Bishop adverts in pathetic terms to the war in America, and to the distress prevalent at Rouen and in neighbouring villages, and enlarges with great appositeness and eloquence upon the sublimity of Christian charity. Regarded in a literary point of view, this letter, like all that the Bishop writes, is an elegant and forcible composition. Mgr. Dupanloup is not, however, very happy in his concluding paragraph. After alluding to a celebrated political economist, a certain M. Adam Schmit—of whom we must confess never having heard before, at least under that name—the Bishop says :—'La vérité est que jamais les œuvres de la charité catholique ne furent plus belles, plus larges, plus multipliées que de nos jours : c'est le salut du monde chrétien, c'est sur-tout l'honneur de la France.' This remark is rather unfortunate. We are far from wishing to depreciate the charity of French Roman Catholics, but, in the case of the starving workmen of Normandy, we must say it stands in melancholy contrast with that of Englishmen generally in the analogous case of Lancashire, and even with that of the French Protestants in behalf of their own famished Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. It was the Protestant daily paper *Le Temps* that first called public attention to the frightful distress existing in different parts of Normandy, in alleviation of which a subscription was opened in its own *bureau* ; and it is another noticeable fact, that the largest sum of money collected in any place of worship in France in behalf of the Rouen poor—indeed, we believe it is the largest amount collected in any French church, and for any object, within the memory of man—was at the Oratoire, after a sermon by the younger Coquerel. The sum received amounted to 15,000 francs. The remainder of the paragraph, if not very reverent or in the best taste, is at least very expressive, and thoroughly French. After speaking of the 'charité catholique,' the Bishop thus continues :—'Dans la charité, comme en toute chose, la vaillance française est au premier rang. C'est, du reste, l'hommage qu'on nous rend partout. Nulle part, dit-on, la charité ne se fait comme en France. De fait, les plus grandes œuvres naissent chez nous, et les nations étrangères se font une gloire de les adopter. Montrons-vous dignes de notre juste renommée. Honneur aux cœurs les plus prompts ! Quand une armée française a devant elle trois cent mille hommes armés, elle crie : Vive la France ! et elle se précipite, sans qu'une compagnie laisse passer une autre compagnie avant elle. Nous

'sommes plus qu'une armée, nous sommes tout une grande nation catholique, et nous avons devant nous cent mille hommes affamés. *Criens : Vive Jésus-Christ !* et allons à la misère comme nous irions au feu pour la combattre et pour la vaincre.'

Lord Stanhope has put forth, under the title of 'Miscellanies' (Murray), an interesting little volume, consisting of unpublished letters and memoranda by Pitt, Burke, Sir John Moore, Sir Robert Peel, Lord Macaulay, and others. The work also includes a correspondence, which took place in 1847, between Sir Robert Peel, Lord Macaulay, and the Editor himself, on the question, 'Were human sacrifices in use among the Romans?' as well as one or two short pieces of poetry by the elder Pitt, Macaulay, and others, which had not seen the light. We quite agree with the noble editor that these 'Miscellanies' are 'worthy of permanent record,' but we think that their extrinsic value would have been increased if they had been published somewhat cheaper.

We doubt whether the cause of sisterhoods, any more than that of true religion, will be greatly benefited by such things as 'The Two Ways of Christian Life:' we feel sure that the Queen's English will not.

We cordially welcome Mr. Bright's translation of 'Eighteen Sermons of S. Leo the Great on the Incarnation' (Masters). The work is enriched with a Preface containing a short account of the Author, and of his more prominent characteristics as a preacher, and with a body of notes selected from English and other theologians, illustrating and elucidating the most important passages in the sermons. These annotations, which are evidently the fruit of wide and careful reading, take up about half the volume, and are of the highest value. The whole work, in short, is a complete theological manual on the Incarnation, and the truths involved in and flowing out of it, and is admirably appropriated to the present time.

Canon Wordsworth's 'The Spirit, the Teacher of the Church,' one of the Oxford Lenten Sermons for 1863, is a striking and comprehensive discourse, written with the author's usual strength and clearness. It seems to exhaust, in a small compass, the subject of which it treats, and it is full throughout of that lofty and chastened eloquence which springs from the heart.

We have no information as to the shape which the very important question, 'The University of Durham—what shall we do with it' (by a Quondam Fellow: Saunders and Otley), may ultimately assume before it leaves the Privy Council. Meantime, Churchmen have been somewhat remiss, not to say indifferent, in regard to it, seeing that it not only touches the general question of educational endowments, but most closely affects the particular credit of theological science in England. The proposals of the Durham University Commissioners go simply to the destruction of theological study at Durham. For, having swept away Hebrew—perhaps the most important field of hermeneutical theology in these times—and curtailed and cheapened the path to every other learning, and then crowned the whole by promising a Divinity Degree to the loose declaration of a *bonâ fide* adherence to the Church of England—what is there left for the work of demolition to do?

These statutory commissions—entrusted, as they are, with such enormous powers, require very close watching: and the sharp practice which has been exhibited by the Durham Commissioners does not inspire confidence. The Commissioners sat for the examination of witnesses on four days in February and March, 1862, and on June 13 of that year produced their 'Ordinances.' The Ordinances were printed by order of the House on July 22, 1862, and on August 7 Parliament was prorogued. During the

recess, these Ordinances, though printed, were not procurable at the Parliamentary Paper Office, or at the Queen's Printers. Forty days are, by statute, allowed to Parliament in which to consider the result of the Commissioners' labours. But *eleven* days at the fag end of last session, and, practically, no day at the beginning of this session—this is the way in which so wholesome a safeguard is exercised! We say, practically, no day in this session; for it was not until the last of the 'forty days,' during which Parliament has the power to reject the Ordinances, that the Ordinances themselves were placed before the House of Lords, and not till a whole week after the 'forty days' were exhausted, that the evidence on which the Ordinances are based was submitted for the information of Parliament. Thus, in effect, the opportunity of discussing one of the most revolutionary plans that was ever proposed for the reconstruction of an important Church University, has been evaded in the House of Commons, and stolen from the House of Lords.

Another fact betokens the reckless haste and off-handedness with which it is possible for a commission of this kind to do irreparable mischief. One of the commissioners, Dr. Vaughan, made and carried a valuable proposal, that the appointment of Professors and Tutors should be vested in the Warden, who, being also Dean of Durham, might not always be other than well affected to the Church. But this resolution was never entered upon the minutes. The Secretary was not in his place; and it remains to this day on the slip of paper on which Dr. Vaughan drew it up, while the Ordinances, as published in the *London Gazette*, and laid before Parliament, place those appointments in the hands of the Senate, the majority of which may be Dissenters or Unbelievers, and enemies to the Church of England!

We gladly call attention to the 'Quondam Fellow's' pamphlet. He is rightfully indignant at the Commissioners' plan for, first, spoiling the University of its property, and then degrading it through its own resources. It is difficult to overstate the boldness and violence of such a measure. The property of the University of Durham is all Church property, and it is manifestly unjust to withdraw her own property from the Church's own exclusive control. But, apart from the crime of spoliation, the Commissioners' scheme is guilty of a blunder. The establishment of a lower-class University on a new model, in which degrees are to derive all their value from the cheapness and rapidity with which they may be reached—set up upon a principle of condescension to the supposed wants of the people, without any such common religious test as Chapel-prayers—is not only a breach of faith with the existing members of the University, but an utter mistake in relation to the great middle-class of Englishmen, who have free access to the old Universities, who want neither easy, nor cheap, nor irreligious Academical distinctions, and who will have the *real* thing, as it has been always received here in England, or *none*.

Theology is the prime end and object for which these Church-funds were first given at Oxford, and afterwards restored at Durham. And theology being of all sciences that of which the systematic study is now the least encouraged, and the most wanted in the English Church, the Durham University funds, either at Durham, or at the old Universities, ought to be reserved for the great work to which they were solemnly destined. The revival of a theological school, affiliated by the ancient universities, which have, alas! suffered the scientific study of theology to drop from their hands, would be of inestimable value to the English Church now and in all time. The Deanery of Durham, and three Canon Professorships—Divinity, Hebrew, and Greek—besides twenty Fellowships, furnish a noble endowment for such a school. The Church of England actually possesses at this moment this endowment for this express purpose, granted to her by gifts of faith and love, and secured to her by law. Will she yield it up without a struggle?

INDEX TO VOL. XLV.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

Agricultural Societies and their Operations [*The Journal of Agriculture*], 263—268.
American Church in the Disruption [*Journal of the Bishops*, &c.], 162—184.

B.

Brizeux's Life and Works [*Œuvres de Brizeux*], 1—24.

C.

Calvinism, its Relation to Modern Doubt [*Essays and Reviews*, &c.], 25—60.
Clergy Relief Bill [*Hansard's Debates*, &c.], 201—207.
Clough, Arthur Hugh [*The Bothie*, &c.], 61—89.
Codex Sinaiticus [*Tischendorf's Edition*], 374—402.
Colenso's last Publication; see also Latitudinarianism [*Colenso on the Pentateuch*], 464—505.

E.

Essays and Reviews [see *Calvinism*, &c.]

F.

Financial Policy, the last Twenty Years of [*Twenty Years of Financial Policy*, by Sir S. Northcote], 201—207.

G.

George, S. Patron Saint of England [*Transactions of Royal Society of Literature*], 316—327.

L.

Latitudinarianism, Recent [*Colenso on the Pentateuch—Tracts for Priests and People*], 225—255.

M.

Merivale's Romans under the Empire [*A History of the Romans*, by Merivale, &c.] 346—375.
Mormons, the Past and Future of the [*Stansbury, Gunnison, Hemy*, &c.], 185—200.

N.

North, Christopher [*A Memoir of John Wilson*], 132—161.
Northcote, Sir Stafford [see *Financial Policy*].

S.

Saisset on Pantheism [*Essay on Religious Philosophy*, &c.], 90—131.
Salem Chapel, 403—432.
Septuagint, Modern Editions of the [*Field, Mai, Tischendorf*, &c.], 289—315.
Scotch Liturgical Matters [*Ferbes' Scotch Liturgy*, &c.], 208—224.

U.

Universalism and Eternal Punishment [*Skinner's Sermons—Passaglia*, &c.], 433—463.

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

JANUARY.—M'Caul's Criticism of Bishop Colenso's Criticism—Sir Roundell Palmer's Book of Praise—Farker's Church Calendar—University Sermons, by Dr. Williams and the Bishop of Oxford—Brown's Recollections of Simeon's Conversation Parties—Eighteen Years of a Clerical Meeting, edited by Seymour and Mackarness—Monro's Pastoral Life—The Bishop of Brechin's Sermons on the Grace of God—Silvio—Thoughts on the Church Catechism—Lomas' Sermons on Idleness and Industry contrasted—Countess Kate—Brett's Churchman's Guide to Faith and Piety—The Chorale Book, edited by Bennett and Goldschmidt—Hooper's Revelation of Jesus Christ Expounded—Some Words to Country Lads—Ancient History for Village Schools—Liddon's Sermon on Active Life, a Criterion of Spiritual Life—Beke's Sermon on the Integrity of the Holy Scriptures—Knight's Pentateuchal Narrative Vindicated—Neale's Earnest Plea for the Scotch Liturgy—Hadden's Sermons on Samuel and King Jehoshaphat—Millard's Sermon on the Sin of Bloodguiltiness—Flower's Church of England on the Continent—Madame Swetchine's Corre-

spondence, edited by M. de Falloux—Gervex's Histoire de la Littérature française depuis ses Origines jusqu'à la Révolution—Montalembert's Le Père Lacordaire—Hubaine's Le Gouvernement temporel des Papes jugé par la Diplomatie française—Wordsworth's Bicentenary Sermon on the Book of Common Prayer—The Bishop of St. Andrew's Bicentenary Address, Reunion of the Church in Great Britain—Low's Charities of London—Bennett's Sermon on Scripture Authority for Choral Worship—Luzarche's Prélats et Mandements—Publications of the Anglo-Continental Society—Tassy's Discours d'Ouverture—Sulla Guerra della Corte di Roma contro il Regno d'Italia—Guizot's Discours Académiques.

APRIL.—M. Malot's La Vie moderne en Angleterre—Lettre de Mgr. l'Evêque d'Orléans demandant une quête générale en faveur des pauvres ouvriers rouennais—Lord Stanhope's Miscellanies—The Two Ways of Christian Life—Bright's translation of Eighteen Sermons of S. Leo the Great on the Incarnation—Canon Wordsworth's The Spirit, the Teacher of the Church—The University of Durham, what shall we do with it? by a Quondam Fellow.

u-
se
u-
ces
ok
n-
he
of
are
s's
he
is-
rte
t's
n-
na
tes
n-
of
on
he
he
do